24029

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* LOIS ELAINE FOSTER

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS of the ROYAL COMMISSION on EDUCATION in ALBERTA 1957 – 1959

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr B.Y. Card

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* 2 November, 1974 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* L. E. Foster

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE*
College of Advanced Education
Armidale NSW 2350
AUSTRALIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE
ROYAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATION
IN ALBERTA 1957-1959

by

© LOIS ELAINE FOSTER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "A Sociological Analysis of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta 1957-1959" submitted by Lois Elaine Foster in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology of Education.

B.Y. Card
Supervisor

Arthur K. Davis

Robert S. Patterson

Donald L. Mills
External Examiner

Date 22 November, 1974

ABSTRACT

There has been a resurgence of interest in theory in contemporary sociology of education without a corresponding empirical exploration of the newer emphases. The relationship of the processes of distribution of power and principles of social control to educational knowledge has been recognized and the methodological implications for research have begun to be examined in relation to the content, form and legitimation of knowledge in the context of classrooms, schools and the curriculum.

The problem selected for this study attempted to probe beyond the curriculum by focussing upon an educational inquiry concerned with power and control of knowledge in a policy context. Sociologically, the problem was to describe, analyse and interpret the emergence, operation and outputs of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta 1957-1959. To accomplish this task, two major paradigms from the sociology of education, the normative and the interpretative, have been utilized. The conceptual tools to analyse the Commission and its work were derived from structural-functionalism and from phenomenological sociology of knowledge. The methodology for the empirical description of the Commission included historical research using primary and secondary sources, systematic analysis of contemporary materials and the survey research technique of the open-ended interview.

The historical survey of Alberta and its educational system provided the socio-historical background of the Cameron Commission. The data from the survey were examined in terms of collective behaviour theory to explain the action of the Alberta government in establishing a Royal Commission after its failure to solve persistent educational problems. The Royal Commission was seen as the institutionalized culmination of norm-oriented collective behaviour in the subsequent structural-functional analysis. This analysis indicated that the linkages of the Commission with outside social systems were strongly developed in relation to professional education. It was shown that there were strains within the Commission associated with the production of a minority as well as a majority report. It was further shown that when the Commission's work was officially ended, there was initiated a rather lengthy process of destructuring the Commission.

The knowledge management of the Commission with its focus on power and control dimensions was subjected to analysis using an augmented sociology of knowledge framework. It was shown that there was government influence on the Commission's knowledge management process at each phase of its existence. The knowledge produced within the Commission was found to have been influenced by the differentiated development and use of power during the different phases of the Commission's work. With respect to the relationship between the Commission and outside groups other than the government in management of knowledge, the input with the greatest apparent impact came from the Catholic briefs. This input culminated in the production of two reports.

To complete the analysis, a re-examination of all data was conducted to contrast and compare the meaning derived from the phenomenological, structural-functional and sociology of knowledge approaches used. The value of the phenomenological approach in suggesting clues and hypotheses which might then be explored by means of the other theoretical frameworks was demonstrated. In addition, a re-examination was carried out of selected aspects of the theories of Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Mannheim, Smelser and Sorokin to see what further insight into the Royal Commission they yielded and also, to explore some possible contributions of this case-study to a critical assessment of the theory under review.

The general conclusion derived from the sociological analysis of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta 1957-1959 was that it should be viewed both as a 'fact' of institutionalization and as a 'problematic,' a product of social arrangements.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to my advisor Dr. B. Y. Card whose scholarship in the sociology of education has both challenged and guided me during the period of the study.

I am indebted to the other members of the supervisory committee for their helpful suggestions and constructive criticism and for other contributions: to Dr. R. Patterson who, in his capacity as Chairman of the Department of Educational Foundations, has taken a sincere interest in my entire doctoral programme, to Dr. A. Davis who has stimulated my interest in the history of sociological thought, and to Dr. P. Meekison who provided valuable information on royal commissions in the initial stages of the project.

I am especially grateful to Dr. D. Mills, as external examiner, for his interest in and critical assessment of the study.

I would also like to acknowledge my gratitude to Helen Clement, John Lyons and Wilma Laing, fellow graduate students, whose friendship has supplied that extra encouragement which only one's peers can give.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1
  The Problem 1
  Significance of the Study 3
  Background to the Study 5
  Delimitations 9
  Methodology 10
  Summary and Preview 12
  Glossary of Terms 14
  Footnotes 16
II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . 19
  Introduction 19
  Theoretical Basis for the Study 22
    Networks of Communication 25
    Phenomenological Sociology 26
    Sociology of Knowledge 27
    Structural-Functionalism 31
  Nature of Royal Commissions: The Institutionalized Model 34
  Evaluation of Source Materials 41
  Limitations of the Study: Resources and Theories . . . 44
  Summary 45

CHAPTER PAGE

Footnotes 46

III. THE SOCIO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE CAMERON COMMISSION . . 52

Introduction 52

Social Changes and Developments in Alberta to the 1960s 54

The Pioneering Phase to the Early Twenties 54

The Agricultural Phase to 1945 56

The Urbanization and Industrialization Phase to the early 1960s 58

Institutions in Alberta 60

The Family 60

Religion 63

The Economy 66

The Polity 69

Changes and Developments in Alberta Education to the 1960s 73

The Pioneer Phase to the Early Twenties 73

The Agricultural Phase to the Mid-1940s 76

The Urbanization and Industrialization Phase to the Early 1960s 79

Emergence of the Cameron Royal Commission 83

Summary and Conclusions 93

Footnotes 95

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE CAMERON COMMISSION: A STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL VIEW 104
  Introduction 104
  Structure of the Commission 105
    Terms of Reference 105
    Membership 107
    Budget 109
    Duration 110
  Function of the Commission 112
    Information-gathering Phase 112
      Mechanism of information-gathering 112
      Nature of Commission information 117
    Evaluation, Consolidation and Reporting Phase . . . 123
      Method of reporting 123
      Knowledge produced 127
      Evaluation and consolidation 128
  Destructuring the Commission 132
    Public Reaction 133
    Official Reaction 138
  Summary and Conclusions 145
  Footnotes 149
V. ANALYSIS OF THE CAMERON COMMISSION: A SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE VIEW 157
  Introduction 157
  The Commission in Relation to the Policy Context of the Alberta Government 163

CHAPTER PAGE

Official Creation Phase 164

Organizational Phase 166

Operational Phase 169

Termination Phase—Early Period 171

Power and Control in Knowledge Management within the Commission 175

Knowledge Management in Relation to Interests and Groups Outside the Commission 182

Summary and Conclusions 193

Footnotes 196

VI. EXPLAINING THE CAMERON COMMISSION: THE QUEST FOR FURTHER MEANING 202

Introduction 202

A Re-examination of Chapters Three to Five in a Quest for Meaning 203

Emergence 203

Organization and Function 206

Knowledge Management and Control 210

The Royal Commission of 1957-1959 in Relation to the Alberta Educational Planning Commission 1969-1972 212

A Re-examination of Sociological Theory in a Quest for Meaning 216

Summary 235

Footnotes 237

CHAPTER PAGE

VII. CONCLUSION 239
  Summary of the Study 239
  Critique of the Methodology 241
  Conclusions and Implications from the Major Components of Analysis 243
    The Socio-Historical Context and Emergence of the Commission 243
    The Operation and Termination of the Commission . . 244
    Power and Control in the Knowledge Management of the Commission 246
    Critical Assessments of the Royal Commission as a Whole 247
  Further Research Suggestions 256
  Concluding Statement 258
  Footnotes 260
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 261
APPENDIX A. COMPARISON OF SELECTED FEATURES OF ROYAL COMMISSIONS IN CANADIAN EDUCATION 275
APPENDIX B. ORDERS-IN-COUNCIL 278
APPENDIX C. BIOGRAPHICAL PROFILES OF COMMISSIONERS 286
APPENDIX D. ARCHIVAL COMMISSION MATERIAL 294
  COMMISSION MATERIAL FROM OTHER SOURCES 316
APPENDIX E. INTERVIEWS 322
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 407

DOMTAR
BELL-FAST BOND

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Selected Group Briefs to Commission	119
2	Index to Recommendations of Commission	130
3	Disposal of Commission Recommendations	142
4	Commission Recommendations Rejected or Unclassified	143
5	Generalizations Concerning Commission Recommendations	144
6	Group Briefs to Commission Classified by Interest Group	185

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Today there is an ambivalence in sociological thought and thus in the sociology of education, which is related to the dilemmas and contradictions inherent in contemporary society.[1] Since sociology is a social invention to produce knowledge for dealing with social change, and the sociology of education has as its specific concern educational knowledge, it is important to visualize this study as a reflection of ferment in all three spheres—society, sociology and the sociology of education.

Structural-functionalism with its emphasis on order and predictability in social systems has been the predominant theoretical approach in North American and British sociology of education.[2] In recent years, while genuine contributions of structural-functionalism have been recognized and acted upon, for example, in aspects of destratification in the British education system, there has been a greater emphasis on the evolution of other approaches to sociology in order to understand and assist the educational process in contemporary societies. Attention is shifting from study of socio-cultural contexts and organizational structures as key variables to the nature of what takes place in classrooms, that is, the social interaction of education. Still more recently, the trend has been to focus on aspects of knowledge itself, that is, how it is organized, legitimated and controlled, especially through curriculum.[3]

Probably the most influential British sociologist directing inquiry to the relationship of knowledge and education from a sociological perspective, is Basil Bernstein. He summarizes some of his major concerns as follows:

> How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control.[4]

The scope of Bernstein's thinking extends beyond the curriculum and includes the most important control agency for education in society—the polity. The problem selected for this study attempts to probe beyond the curriculum and organization of education by selecting as the focus of inquiry a particular royal commission established to deal with education in one particular society. Sociologically the problem is to describe, analyse and interpret the emergence, operation and outputs of this royal commission. This will be accomplished by bringing together two major paradigms which are involved in the resurgence of interest in theory in contemporary sociology of education—the normative (in which structural-functionalism is the dominant perspective) and the interpretative (subsuming sociology of knowledge and interactionist approaches including phenomenology).

The main purpose of the present study is to undertake a sociological inquiry into the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta 1957-1959 attempting to utilize two paradigms from contemporary sociology of education in a complementary manner. It is anticipated therefore, that a more thorough and complete description and explanation of a specific educational phenomenon related to the social control of knowledge will be produced.

The Royal Commission on Education has been selected because it is a concrete example of the processes of distribution of power and principles of social control in relation to educational knowledge. The date of the Commission limits the inquiry undertaken in the sense that it must be ex post facto. However, this study aims to show that a royal commission on education is problematic, even though the use and nature of royal commissions have been for many years institutionalized in Canadian society. It is important to know how the Commission was created, how it operated and what it contributed. Answers to these questions are sought by use of the concepts of structural-functional theory. It is also important to know why the Commission was initiated, why certain decisions were made on what constitutes appropriate and legitimate educational knowledge, why recommendations of the Commission were directed as they were, and why they were assimilated at different rates in the various components of Alberta's educational system. The theoretical approach adopted to deal with the "why" questions is phenomenological sociology of knowledge.

Significance of the Study

The sociological analysis of this particular public inquiry into education involves both description and explanation. To achieve this, the socio-historical context in which the Commission arose, the raison d'être and strategies of its operation and the reciprocal relationship between social structure and knowledge which provided the dialectic within which the nature and direction of educational innovation was shaped, require examination.

In theoretical terms, the study is potentially significant because it draws on both the normative and interpretative paradigms which are prominent in contemporary sociology of education.[5] The normative paradigm derives from structural-functional or systems theory in sociology whereas the interpretative paradigm has its roots in the sociology of knowledge and interactionist approaches. (See the Glossary of Terms at the end of the chapter.) Only selected aspects of the perspectives from these two paradigms are used. It is a central assumption that the paradigms are essentially complementary and that both are needed in achieving a high level of description and explanation which are basic to sociological analysis. This study is a test of the assumption. The sociology of education literature of very recent years has included extensive discussion of theoretical issues, usually concluding with a plea for some sort of empirical testing of the ideas.[6] In this sense, the study is an attempt to conduct field research on an actual educational phenomenon to contribute to the store of applications of the newer theoretical frameworks.

However, an investigation of a royal commission is not a theoretical concern only. Educational inquiries, as well as education itself, arouse a great deal of public interest and comment. Discussion on educational matters at the public level, as even a superficial survey of the media indicates, are frequently ill-informed and biased.

Thus, as a practical measure, studies such as the one proposed may act as a source of information and interpretation which will provide a sounder base for viewing other educational phenomena and future public inquiries into education.

Background to the Study

As indicated at the beginning of the chapter, the essential feature of an educational system is the control of knowledge.[7] Control is derived from external sources in the society and from sources within the educational institution itself. Such an assumption has a number of implications. The first is that the term education inevitably has political and thus ideological connotations. All decisions and non-decisions[8] made about educational priorities occur in situations of differential access to resources of two kinds, economic support and cognitive legitimacy.[9] Many people, both professional educators and laymen do not recognize education as political in this sense. Rather, they tend to see an interrelationship between the political and educational institutions in everyday, simplistic structural-functional terms. That is, to understand the functioning of education systems one looks at the schools, the teachers, the pupils, the curriculum and also takes into account the authority of four public bodies, the legislature, the cabinet, the municipal council and the school board. In such a scheme, it is common for the obvious interrelations of education and other societal institutions—the family, the economy, religion—to be recognized, but the political aspects of the legitimising of knowledge are likely to be unnoticed.

A second implication of focussing on the control of knowledge is that definitions of educational knowledge differ according to the source of the definition but whatever the interpretation, it can be regarded as an imposed definition of reality. For example, the Department of Education may lay down that particular subjects are to be taught. Departmental curriculum committees select aims and content to form curricula to be sent to schools. However, teachers in classrooms and professors in the university may impose their own interpretations of the reality represented by such subjects as Biology 30 or Mathematics 30. The university may deem the content or the ways these subjects have been taught as deficient for its purposes. No small part of the work of a royal commission on education is to disclose the variety of definitions of educational knowledge held, and to establish priorities for legitimating definitions.

As suggested in the above example, socio-cultural influences operating internally and externally with respect to a given educational system, may affect the selection and transmission of knowledge. Distinctions are made between intellectual knowledge—certified as suitable to be learned in school and commonsense knowledge—acceptable in everyday life but not necessarily appropriate for school. Therefore, those in power attempt to control the distribution of educational knowledge, to determine what is valid public knowledge, and to monitor to whom it will be transmitted, how and when. If one can assume that people tend to act in one way rather than another because of their store of information at a given time, then it follows that with differential access to knowledge, a diversity of actions is possible for those who are the products of the schools.[10] This has implications for the people who are educated, but also for educational policy-makers. A lack of diversity or too much diversity may prove dysfunctional for a particular society. When such a condition becomes obvious, educational policy-makers may be challenged or replaced.

A further implication would be the idea that the education system acts as a selective filter and distributor of educational knowledge to prepare students for their future networks of social relationships.[11] This raises questions relating to the fostering of certain values and not others, and the setting of certain goals and not others. It also raises questions about the process by which different types of students are labelled and allocated to certain educational routes and not others, and subjected to one set of learning experiences and not another set. Underlying these choices are ideologies which motivate action and provide explanations of what is occurring in education.

To examine an education system within the framework of implications presented in this section represents a task of considerable magnitude, an unmanageable task if one's focus were defined simply as the control of knowledge. Therefore, though the present study was oriented more to the macrolevel of education, it focussed on a specific royal commission in an effort to develop insights into the political character and competing definitions of education, including the ways in which this competition was controlled, and the selective, filtering and distributive properties of Alberta's education system.

It is important in the study to recognize the origin and purpose of the royal commission as an investigatory model. Although royal commissions are discussed more fully in chapter two, one must note at the outset that a royal commission is a social invention which has been institutionalized in Canadian society. Governments confronted by ambiguous or crisis situations may establish a royal commission with definite goals, ad hoc organization and a limited duration. Thus, public inquiry into education is frequently made at a time of technological, ideological and social change when there is confusion over what counts as educational knowledge.

Royal commissions, set up by an Order-in-Council of the government of the day, purport to tap public and professional opinion in the task of surveying problems and attempting to provide solutions to them. In this way, a royal commission on education is involved in exploring the definitions of educational knowledge that are held by different groups. The mandate of the commission includes the obligation to prepare a report for the government in which are contained recommendations for changes which aim to eliminate weaknesses and reinforce strengths of the existing education system. The setting up of a commission can be thought of as an act of control. The work of the commission itself may be regarded both as an out-put of policy as well as an in-put to policy-making. From the commission, the government receives knowledge from which it may select all or part for implementation. The implemented recommendations, officially diffused to the education system, impinge on the examination/teaching/control/administration aspects of schools, also encouraging or forcing them to make some sort of response.

Since royal commissions have existed as intermittent institutions in Canadian society for some time, the task of studying a particular royal commission is somewhat facilitated, as the general pattern of organization and procedures are widely known and followed. In the case of an educational commission, the relatively large measure of autonomy it enjoys and its wide powers make it an effective instrument for achieving its manifest task of collecting information. However, analysis is needed to disclose the latent aspects of a commission's work, especially those revealing the control of knowledge in a particular educational setting.

Delimitations

There are three major delimitations of this study. The first is a deliberate focus on the rise, organization and function of the Cameron Commission but not on its impact on Alberta education. The impact of the Commission has been the subject of study,[12] although there remains more to be investigated along this line. The second delimitation is implicit in the choice of theoretical perspectives. Much of the rich detail of an historical study is omitted, condensed or used only as an example, as structure and function are cast into a sociological mold and then re-examined in a search for meaning, for answers to the question "why?". The third delimitation is that this study does not attempt to compare the Alberta Royal Commission of 1957-1959 with other public educational inquiries or commissions. This is a task for other research.

Methodology

Data for chapters one to four; the problem, the conceptual framework, a socio-historical survey of Alberta and its educational system and an analysis of the Royal Commission on Education 1957-1959 on a structural-functional dimension were derived largely from secondary analysis of written source materials. The findings of chapters three and four hopefully provide a normative view of the Commission to contrast and complement the interpretative trend in the treatment of the data in the succeeding chapter.

The structural-functional perspective in sociological theory is manifested by the treatment of the socio-historical context of the Cameron Commission in chapter three and the analysis of the Commission in chapter four. The functionalist approach attempts to discover the social function performed by the institution of the Royal Commission which reveals its contribution to the encouragement and persistence of social cohesion and unity and constraints operating on Alberta as a social system because of the diffusion of shared values. The various institutions of society—education, the polity, religion, the economy and the family—are shown in their relationship to one another and to the society as a whole.[13]

A theoretical base drawn from the sociology of knowledge and phenomenology provides the perspective for interpreting the data in chapter five. The Commission is seen as a means of social control because of its influence on the social distribution of educational knowledge. The attempt is made to trace the connection between particular interest groups in Albertan society and their educational ideas, perhaps to uncover both ideologies and utopias.[14] Factors responsible for selection or rejection of certain ideas by certain groups and the motives and interests that prompted certain groups consciously to foster these ideas and disseminate them among wider sections are taken into account. Attention is paid also to individuals whose social position allowed them to accumulate, preserve, reformulate or disseminate the intellectual heritage of their groups.[15]

The methodology employed to achieve an interpretative view of the Commission includes historical research, systematic analysis of contemporary sources and the survey analysis technique of the open-ended interview. A phenomenological stance is adopted with respect to the in-depth interviews with key influentials associated with the Commission. The researcher is concerned with the manner in which the individual perceived reality in the social situation related to the Commission and how he responded to this perception. It is assumed that the social constructions of reality of these individuals are social knowledge and do indeed constitute important data on the Commission.

As Doern and Aucoin have cautioned, questionnaire methods are inappropriate for the higher echelons of policy-makers.[16] This is the justification for the open-ended interview technique used in the study. It does of course raise certain problems, not the least of which is verification of the data obtained. Internal validity checks were built in by asking the same question but in a different way in the same interview and by asking a number of interviewees the same question in different interviews. In addition, wherever possible, external validity checks were applied by using other sources of information such as newspaper reports, references in books, legislative enactments. Thus, a range of data-gathering devices was employed to attempt to ensure a sound basis for discussion and interpretation.

Glossary of Terms

In a sociological study, terms may be used which are understood differently in other contexts. A glossary of terms has been included at the end of this chapter to provide the meaning which pertains here, and to avoid giving explanations in later chapters where it may distract from the discussion.

Summary and Preview

The purpose of the introductory chapter has been to define the problem, a sociological analysis of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta 1957-1959, to indicate the significance of such a study and to discuss its background. The delimitations of the study and the methodology to be employed in collecting, analysing and interpreting the data have been presented. The study will continue in chapter two with a detailed discussion of the conceptual framework upon which the study is based. An elaboration of the socio-historical context in which the Cameron Commission arose will comprise chapter three. Chapters four and five will analyse the Commission along two dimensions; one derived from structural-functionalism and the other from the sociology of knowledge. In chapter six, an interpretation and synthesis of the sociological description and explanation of the Royal Commission will be attempted.

The final chapter will comprise a critical summary of the study, its limitations, findings and implications, and suggestions for further research. A detailed bibliography, appendices of related material and a list of abbreviations used will complete the study.

DOMTAR
BELL-FAST BOND
50% COTTON

Glossary of Terms

Comparison of normative and interpretative viewpoints:[17]

Comparison Element	Normative	Interpretative
Theoretical referent	Structural functionalism	Sociology of knowledge and interactionist approaches
Content	Macro-structural relationships	Focus on knowledge properties
Basic unit	Element of structure, e.g. Role	A situated activity
Technique of inquiry	Social survey (closed questionnaires)	Case studies of on-going activities
Assumptions	Assumes a normative (norm based) system and the problems of its acquisition (through socialization)	Takes as problematic the normative (taken for granted, norm based) system and its acquisition

Ideology: A system of ideas and judgments, which are explicit and generally organized and which serve to describe, explain, interpret or justify the situation of a group or collectivity.[18]

Institutions: Are formal, recognized, established, and stabilized ways of pursuing some activity in society.[19]

Networks: The links between workers in the same field which permit the easiest and most satisfying flow of ideas.[20]

Norms: Collective ways of acting, thinking and feeling which are external to individuals and which exert a constraining power on their conduct.[21]

Policy: A course of action or intended course of action conceived as deliberately adapted, after a review of possible alternatives, and pursued, or intended to be pursued.[22]

Social control:[23] Denotes that society contains limiting and conditioning forces which influence all social interactions.[24]

Social role: The social role is made up of the patterns which are specific to a function or a position in a collectivity.[25]

Social status: A way of defining one's social identity in relation to the network of occupations.[26]

Social structure: Groups in their interrelationships and their values or institutionalized patterns of normative culture.[27]

Socialization: The process through which the human individual learns and internalizes throughout his life the socio-cultural elements of his environment, integrating them into the structure of his personality under the influence of meaningful social agents and personal experiences and thus adapting himself to the social environment in which he must live.[28]

Systematic: Marked by or manifesting system, method or orderly procedure; following or observing a plan.[29]

Utopias: Complexes of ideas, held consciously or unconsciously, which tend to generate activities towards change of the present order.[30]

Values: A value is a way of being or acting which a person or a collectivity recognizes as ideal and which renders desirable or worthy of respect the person's behaviour to which it is attributed.[31]

Footnotes

[1] This view held by sociologists like Friedrich and Gouldner has been discussed in an article by R. Dale, "Phenomenological Perspectives and the Sociology of the School," Education Review 25 (1973): 175-179. The value of Dale's article is the linking of these conflicts in sociology with the ferment in the "new" sociology of education.

[2] J. Eggleston, "Sociology and the Sociology of Education," University of Alberta, November 1973 (Mimeographed), pp. 2-4.

[3] M. F. D. Young, ed., Knowledge and Control (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971). The introduction by Young provides a useful discussion of this development. The contributions to the book indicate the heightened interest in sociology of the curriculum among British sociologists of education.

[4] B. Bernstein, "On the Classification and Framing of Knowledge," in Knowledge and Control, ed. M. F. D. Young (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), p. 47.

[5] A useful overview of the older and newer theoretical approaches in the sociology of education is provided by the Introduction to Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change, ed. Richard Brown (London: Tavistock, 1973), pp. 1-16. These trends may then be explored in greater depth by examining the collected papers in this volume which were originally presented at the 1970 Annual Conference of the British Sociological Association. Note that this study is not using the Hansen interpretation of "normative" inquiry (as opposed to "empirical" inquiry) which appears in his chapter "The Uncomfortable Relation of Sociology and Education," in On Education Sociological Perspectives, eds. D. Hansen and J. Gerstl (New York: John Wiley, 1967), especially pp. 16-17.

[6] This may be illustrated by the argument advanced in the Introduction to Knowledge and Control, ed. M. F. D. Young (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), pp. 1-17; A. H. Halsey's discussion entitled "Theoretical Advance and Empirical Challenge," in Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems, ed. Earl Hopper (London: Hutchinson, 1971), pp. 262-281; or Eggleston's interpretation of changes in the field in his paper "Sociology and the Sociology of Education," University of Alberta, November 1973 (Mimeographed), especially pp. 2-4.

[7] Ioan Davies, "Knowledge, Education, and Power," in Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change, ed. Richard Brown (London: Tavistock, 1973), p. 331.

[8] Non-decision making as explained by P. Bachrach and M. Baratz, "Decisions and NonDecisions," American Political Science Review 57 (1963): 632, is the practice of limiting the scope of actual decision making to "safe" issues by manipulating the dominant community values, myths, and political institutions and procedures.

[9] This view, with acknowledgment to Pierre Bourdieu, is discussed in Michael Young, "On the Politics of Educational Knowledge," Economy and Society 1 (1972): 194.

[10] The study of the relationship between social structure and consciousness was the focus of the early sociology of knowledge, for example, certain ideas of Marx, Durkheim, Mannheim. However it is only recently that contemporary sociologists like Bernstein, Young, Davies, Bourdieu have begun to combine this approach with others, such as the phenomenological, to throw into strong relief the importance of knowledge as a crucial study in the sociology of education. The writers imply that a sociology of knowledge will have to deal not only with the empirical variety of knowledge in human societies but also with the process by which any body of knowledge comes to be socially established as reality.

[11] Discussion of this view is by Dennis Smith in "Selection and Knowledge Management," in Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems, ed. Earl Hopper (London: Hutchinson, 1971), pp. 139-158.

[12] See footnote 8, Chapter II.

[13] O. Banks, The Sociology of Education (London: Batsford, 1968), p. 10.

[14] Louis Wirth's Introduction to Ideology and Utopia, by Karl Mannheim (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1936), p. xxix, presents the Mannheimian definition of ideologies as "complexes of ideas, held consciously or unconsciously, which tend to generate activities towards maintenance of the existing order." The Rocher definition, however, has been adopted in the study and appears in the glossary after the Summary and Preview in this chapter. Rocher's general definition of "ideology" is appropriate in some sections whereas Mannheim's classic dichotomy of "ideologies and utopias" is most relevant in other sections.

[15] These research emphases are derived from Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge, a concise explanation of which is contained in Louis Wirth's Introduction to Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1936), pp. x-xxx.

[16] G. Doern and P. Aucoin, The Structures of Policy-Making in Canada (Toronto: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 30-31.

[17] Taken from S. J. Eggleston's unpublished paper "Sociology and the Sociology of Education," University of Alberta, November 1973 (Mimeographed), pp. 10-12.

[18] G. Rocher, *A General Introduction to Sociology: A Theoretical Perspective* (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1972), p. 393.

[19] R. Bierstedt, *The Social Order* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1957), p. 320.

[20] E. Crawford and A. Biderman, eds., *Social Scientists and International Affairs* (New York: John Wiley, 1968), pp. 75-76.

[21] G. Rocher, op. cit., p. 27.

[22] J. Gould and W. Kolb, eds., *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences* (Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1964), p. 509.

[23] A Parsonian interpretation can be found in G. Rocher, op. cit., p. 311.

[24] J. Gould and W. Kolb, eds., op. cit., p. 650.

[25] G. Rocher, op. cit., pp. 32-33.

[26] Ibid., p. 232.

[27] J. Gould and W. Kolb, eds., op. cit., p. 650-651.

[28] G. Rocher, op. cit., p. 108.

[29] P. Gove, ed., *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam, 1966), p. 2322.

[30] Louis Wirth's Introduction, op. cit., p. xxix.

[31] G. Rocher, op. cit., p. 27.

DOMTAR
BELL-FAST BOND

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The study attempts a sociological analysis and critique. What do these terms convey? According to the dictionary, an analysis is:

> The act of ascertaining, separating or unfolding in order the elements of a complex body, substance, or treatise.[1]

A critique refers to "a critical examination or review."[2] Both terms are employed to give emphasis to the intention of questioning the conventional way of dealing with such a phenomenon as a royal commission.

What is specifically sociological about the study? It is not the methodology. The techniques of historical research, particularly analysis of primary and secondary sources, systematic analysis of contemporary materials such as newspapers and the use of the interview may be employed by researchers in many fields. The position taken here is that it must be the theory which gives a sociological focus and direction to the task. Therefore, in this chapter, both the nature of and the reasons for selection of normative structural-functional theory and sociology of knowledge and phenomenological approaches subsumed by the term interpretative, will be discussed. The derivation of the methodology from the theoretical bases will be made explicit.

The royal commission as a method of public inquiry has a long history of usage in Britain. While its usage is not of such long-standing in the Canadian setting, it has been invoked extensively by both federal and provincial governments to serve a diversity of ends. Because of the institutionalization of the commission form, the study of a particular commission cannot be undertaken without a clear understanding of the general nature of commissions. This exposition will occupy the second part of the chapter.

An academic study traditionally contains a review of the literature from which accounts of work in the same area, authoritative statements, theoretical propositions and so on, may be drawn and used to give shape, and in some ways legitimacy, to the proposed study. In the present case, a review of appropriate literature is by no means a simple task, for two reasons.

In the first place, the study is not empirical or quantitative in the usual sense of the term. It has been suggested that it might be thought of as a qualitative field study[3] because the Commission is being used as a specific case, a limited scale-model, to reflect certain processes which operate in the much wider and on-going educational system. Although it is an *ex post facto* study, contact was possible with thirteen key actors who participated in the phenomenon.[4] This allowed the possibility of interaction between the researcher and the researched. Literature on this type of study in the sociology of education is extremely limited. However, an exemplar for the study was Young's examination of the Schools Council in Britain which discussed the implications of recognising the political character of education and educational knowledge.[5]

Secondly, a survey of bibliographies of Canadian theses and articles in academic journals and other publications, has failed to reveal any sociological studies of public inquiries into education. One sociological thesis from the province of Alberta used selected aspects of the Cameron Commission as data for a broader study on values.[6] A valuable historical survey of the use of the royal commission on education in Canada in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was presented for a doctoral degree in an Ontario university.[7] Various aspects of implementation of recommendations of the Alberta Royal Commission on Education provided the topic for three theses in educational administration at the University of Alberta.[8]

Assuming that an accurate search of the literature has been made, the present researcher has been faced with the task of "making" rather than "taking" ready-made an educational problem for study. The topic, therefore, has sprung from theoretical considerations in the sociology of education rather than an area which has undergone extensive investigation previously. It is for these reasons that the emphasis has been to discuss the appropriate theory in the first section of the chapter, and then to provide a detailed examination of the nature of royal commissions. Finally, an evaluation of the extent and adequacy of written primary and secondary source materials, appropriate in terms of the theoretical framework to be used to examine a particular commission, has been included.

Theoretical Basis for the Study

The selection of theory to provide the conceptual tools for describing and explaining a particular educational phenomenon arose from the initial assumptions made about the topic. Asking the question why a royal commission on education in 1957 in Alberta rather than simply how did the Cameron Commission in 1957 in Alberta carry out its task, provides a distinctive orientation. The occurrence of a public investigation into education is no longer being taken for granted, to use Young's terminology.[9] Thus the first assumption is that of considering the whole matter of a commission to be problematic. This infers other questions, answers to some of which lie in the province of the sociology of knowledge and others in the province of structural-functionalism.

The second assumption is that the major concern of an educational system is the management of knowledge. In the management of knowledge, the schools are involved in a process of knowledge transmission within the framework of power relations which mediate the varying pressures impinging on them. These pressures emanate from groups and agencies representing other societal institutions or their sub-systems. These groups seek to impose their meanings on the transmission process: their perceptions of the nature of the world and the relationships within it.[10] The study of the many structural and functional features of an educational system is useful for identifying outside pressures on educational knowledge and thus locating the system in its societal context. However, it follows from the second assumption that a focus on knowledge transmission itself will enhance an understanding of both the distribution of power and the principles of social control operating within education.[11]

Public education has become such a massive and complicated enterprise that even governments cannot maintain a completely effective monitoring system on it. Dysfunctions arise from within the system and external to it with consequent stresses and strains. The third assumption therefore, is that education systems have to be looked at from both the point of view of collective behaviour, which attempts to redefine unstructured situations, and conventional behaviour, which is the working out of established expectations through established means.[12] When critical underdefined situations occur, it is always problematic how they will be dealt with. These situations may be resolved through competition or conflict in an effort by those in power to legally or legitimately define the situation against competitors, but even these actions may be supplemented through collective efforts to redefine the situation. The behaviour and the situation have not been institutionalized or have been only partially or intermittently institutionalized. In this inquiry, the prospect of having to look at the phenomenon from a collective behaviour approach must be kept open as a prelude to sociologically conventional structural-functional examination which tends to assume the existence of an ongoing social system.

It follows from the above line of reasoning that given crises or ambiguous situations in which public education may find itself, many devices have been evolved or invented to expose problems and to provide information to solve them. In Canadian society, one such device is the royal commission which can be thought of as an intermittent, limited-life, institution for managing actual or incipient collective behaviour. This behaviour is pre-institutional so far as the education system is concerned. Consequently, a fourth assumption is that for a limited period, a royal commission accepts society's role of selecting, classifying, distributing, transmitting and evaluating certain educational knowledge.[13]

The royal commission reflects the power structure in society in that it is an instrument deliberately established by the polity to investigate certain problems. It is not an endogenous development within a provincial educational system. Thus it acts as an external constraint or as a form of social control. It is clear that to answer the many "how" and "why" questions surrounding such an interesting and complex phenomenon requires an understanding of a commission's socio-historical context, its emergence, the logistics of its operation and also the interplay between individuals, groups and ideas in their socio-cultural context which affect the commission's operation, its manifest outcomes and its latent functions.

The first step is to select a specific commission to delimit the field for study and to use appropriate theoretical and methodological concepts for its analysis. The proposal is that a combination of structural-functionalism augmented with collective behaviour theory, and sociology of knowledge assisted by the idea of networks of communication derived from policy-oriented social science, would serve this purpose. With respect to methodology, an additional input is required because of the need to take account of the meaningful interactions of men. Phenomenological sociology has this emphasis and is not antipathetic to the sociology of knowledge. One of phenomenology's important assumptions is that men's actions are explainable in terms of their biography, knowledge at hand and selectivity of interests.[14] These considerations have provided the rationale for the intensive interviews which are an important part of the data collected for this study. The task remaining is to outline those features of the theoretical base which are invoked in undertaking a sociological analysis of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta 1957-1959.

Networks of Communication

In social systems in which individuals and their groups share a common focus of concern over policy-making, the field becomes structured. According to Crawford, the structuring develops

> . . . along the lines of communication patterns or "networks," the function of which is to permit the easiest and most satisfying flow of ideas, information and decisions. These networks can be regarded as adaptive mechanisms in the sense that they bridge the gaps created by artificial boundaries of organizations and institutions.[15]

To identify the networks operating in a particular field of interest, one needs to determine in advance various points of reference. Ecological reference points in social space[16] could include: personal conversations in informal, unstructured situations, the meetings where exchanges of views occur, the audiences and publics toward which groups direct the product of their work. From the same ecological viewpoint, it is important to take into account the levels of social organization at which the problems for groups are found and the distance of the group participants from the site of making of policy. Of concern also, is the impact of particular methods used by groups in their problem-solving, for example, when the government withdraws from direct participation in a controversial situation by establishing a royal commission.[17]

It is considered that the identification of networks of communication and their social space ecology will be a tool of value in understanding the operation of the royal commission.

Phenomenological Sociology

The introduction to the chapter has indicated that the phenomenological orientation has found its expression in one particular feature of the methodology of the present study. Secondly, it has been implied rather than stated that recognition of the social basis of men's ideas or knowledge is shared by both the sociology of knowledge and phenomenological sociology. This is an assumption which the study does not set out to prove, rather the expectation is that it will serve the pragmatic purpose of facilitating explanation. For these reasons, the following comment is limited to a brief statement of the one facet of phenomenology which relates to the theoretical basis of the study.

The phenomenologist begins with the individual's social construction of reality, that is, he assumes that knowledge is essentially subjective. Thus, social reality comprises the meanings which actors give to their actions and situations. Each actor, confronted by a situation, brings to bear his own "biography" to allow him to cope with it. His biography provides him with knowledge of two kinds; that based on the past experience of others and transmitted to him (socially derived knowledge), and socially approved knowledge, accepted by the individual and his in-group, mediated by personal experience. Whether a given situation is reacted to *in toto*, in part or ignored is further related to the individual's interests, both in degree and kind, which are closely related to an individual's stock of knowledge. The essential point is that the interpretation of the situation in which an individual finds himself contributes to and becomes part of the construction of reality for that individual and he acts in terms of it.[18]

From a phenomenological perspective, an important question raised in this study is what "realities" were constructed by the individual commissioners, by individuals appointing them and by those who worked with them. How did these persons perceive the task of the Commission and the part each had to play? In seeking answers to these questions, it was necessary to ask the individuals themselves, hence the inclusion of lengthy interviews with the commissioners and other influentials, in the methodology of the study.

Sociology of Knowledge

The sociology of knowledge perspective illustrated in particular by the work of Karl Mannheim, has been used extensively in formulating the objectives of the present study. The fundamental premise of this perspective has been stated succinctly by Crawford and Biderman:

> Knowledge whether in the form of subjective beliefs or objective "truths" is seen as socially conditioned.[19]

Alan Blum has included in one of his articles a penetrating comment from Marx which is an extension of this premise:

> Knowledge is not disinterested . . . the construction of a corpus of knowledge is inextricably linked to the interests of those who produced it. Thus, a critique of knowledge is necessarily a critique of the producers of knowledge.[20]

The focus on knowledge *per se*, on the individuals and groups who specialize in the production of knowledge, and on the social behaviour, roles and institutions specific to the creation of knowledge are all subsumed by the term sociology of knowledge.

Mannheim sought to trace the connection between particular interest groups in society and their ideas and modes of thought. He attempted to show that ideologies and utopias do not merely distort thought in relation to the object of observation, but also help to fix attention upon aspects of the situation which might otherwise pass unnoticed. The recognition of the influence of ideologies or utopias on thought is important in this study in helping to give meaning to conduct associated with the Royal Commission. The importance of this contribution is elaborated briefly.

In seeking to find the meaning of behaviour, the sociology of knowledge tries to uncover the motives impelling intellectual activity and also to examine the extent to which thought processes are influenced by the involvement of the thinker in social life. The sociology of knowledge takes into account the entire social setting, not merely the ideas of a group within it at a certain time. This means that careful attention is given to factors responsible for the selection or rejection of certain ideas by certain groups in society and of the motives and interests that prompt certain groups consciously to promote these ideas and disseminate them among wider sections.

In the sociology of knowledge, the focus is not solely on groups, but also on individuals whose function it is to accumulate, preserve, re-formulate or disseminate the intellectual heritage of their groups. Questions related to the nature of their reference groups, their social derivation, the method by which they are recruited, their organization, the rewards for their work would form the framework of a sociology of knowledge study in this area.[21]

In elaborating the concerns of the sociology of knowledge as a field of inquiry, two aspects need to be clarified in relation to the present study. One is the close connection between knowledge and structure. Sociology of knowledge as theory was considered by Mannheim and Bottomore,[22] to take two forms: an empirical investigation through description and structural analysis of the ways in which social relationships influence thought—a theory of existential determination of thinking; an epistemological inquiry concerned with the bearing of this interrelationship on the problem of validity.[23] The first form of sociology of knowledge theory was the concern of this study.

This ex post facto analysis of the Royal Commission is an attempt to examine the ways in which social relationships influence thought, but in a relatively limited context of one provincial society and one commission. Thus the second aspect indicates that both phenomenological sociology and the sociology of knowledge are considered indispensable for the interpretative paradigm used in this study, as part of the larger paradigm in contemporary sociology of education.

Much of the theory of the sociology of knowledge has been derived from micro-level sociology. This has been offset to a degree by the work of Keddie, Esland, Young and others, which deals with the process of knowledge creation and control in the classroom and with curriculum design and control.[24] These studies attempt to use a sociology of knowledge perspective in order to find the relationships between the content, form and the legitimation of knowledge within the structure of classrooms, schools and the curriculum. In this study where the focus is on knowledge at the policy-level, it seems appropriate to augment the sociology of knowledge approaches, as evolving in British sociology of education, with a greater emphasis on knowledge in relation to power and the decision process in policy-making and with the way in which power is distributed in a policy-making body.

In the present study, two theoretical models relating to power are called upon. The first is Cartwright's typology of power associated with leadership, influence and control.[25] Five types of power are identified and termed reward, coercive, referent, legitimate and expert. This conception of power provides a link between processes of social influence and the motivation of the individual. The second is Lasswell's model of the decision process in relation to anticipated power outcomes in terms of government bodies.[26] In this model seven power outcomes are seen as forming a sequential array: intelligence, promotion, prescription, invocation, application, termination and appraisal.[27]

It is assumed that a royal commission and the government establishing it will use different types of power and also make use of the decision process as it is related to different power outcomes in producing, controlling and legitimating educational knowledge. The relationships of power to knowledge are of considerable importance as a royal commission represents, for a time, the legitimate power of the State to produce knowledge related to educational problems.

Structural-Functionalism

In using structural-functionalism in this study, it is possible to draw on a rich store of sociological theory and experience which is beginning to converge in the contemporary sociology of education with the two perspectives just described. The Durkheimian tradition has proved to be one of the dominant and persistent themes in functionalism. Walsh captures its essential facet in saying that:

> [Functionalism] explains social order as being out there in an external social world produced by relationships between factors external to the members of the world, primarily through the agency of shared norms and values.[28]

Structural-functionalism, depending as it does on externality and constraint, is centrally concerned with the problem of order; with the social function performed by the parts which contribute to the cohesion of the whole. An important contribution of the structural-functional approach is that it clearly shows how the various institutions of society relate to the wider social structure. In this sense, the present study includes an examination of one intermittent institution, a royal commission, in its environing social structure.

The structural-functional perspective further stresses the systemic properties of social wholes.[29] As Gouldner has commented:

> The intellectual foundation of functional theory in sociology is the concept of a "system." Functionalism is nothing if it is not the analysis of social patterns as parts of larger systems of behaviour and belief.[30]

The basic question asked is what holds a system (in this case, Alberta society, its educational system, its Royal Commission on Education) together? Subsidiary questions include why do members of social systems continue to participate in them? Why do they adhere to its norms or exhibit consensus? Bernard Barber would reply that:

> Social systems are relatively determinate, boundary-maintaining systems in which the parts are interdependent in certain ways to preserve one another and the character of the system as a whole.[31]

Do Barber's conclusions hold? If so, why and to what extent? Because social systems exist, there are always consequences from their existence. In this study, the consequences of establishing a royal commission need to be examined and interpreted. As an aid to these tasks, Merton's classification of consequences expressed as manifest and latent functions and as functions, dysfunctions and non-functions are invoked. These terms are considered so important that they are defined at this juncture.

> Functions are those observed consequences which make for the adaptation or adjustment of a given system . . . Dysfunctions those observed consequences that lessen the adaptation or adjustment of the system . . . Nonfunctional consequences are simply irrelevant to the system under discussion . . . Manifest functions are those objective consequences contributing to the adjustment or adaptation

> of the system that are recognized and intended by participants in the system . . . Latent functions, correlatively, being those which are neither intended nor recognized.[32]

So far the more standard aspects of structural-functionalism have been reviewed. However, one of the acknowledged weaknesses of structural-functionalism, as used in sociology of education and sociology generally, is its inability to deal adequately with the emergence of change in systems,[33] and with the processes of competition, conflict and creativity that inhere in social interaction as well as processes leading to order, conformity and control.[34]

In this study, the social system under examination was artificially created and had a limited life-span. That it emerged at all was problematic. In order to analyse the ambiguous situation which had to be redefined to produce the Cameron Commission, which was a change in the existing social system, concepts from Smelser's theory of collective behaviour are used to augment those from the more standard structural-functionalism described above. According to Smelser:

> Collective behaviour examines social organization in the process of its emergence from relatively unstructured interaction.[35]

Collective and conventional behaviour have been defined earlier in the chapter and their relevance for the field of education indicated. Central to Smelser's theory are the determinants of collective behaviour; structural conduciveness (predisposition to a given type of collective behaviour), structural strain (ambiguities, conflicts), growth and spread of a generalized belief, precipitating factors, mobilization of participants for action and operation of social control.[36] These concepts are called upon at the end of chapter three and at the beginning of chapter four in the analysis of the pre-institutionalized behaviour from which the Royal Commission emerged.

Nature of Royal Commissions: The Institutionalized Model

Henderson has included in his checklist of federal royal commissions in Canada a working definition of the term by J. C. Courtney:

> A royal commission of inquiry is an ad hoc, advisory organization of one or more Commissioners, appointed by the Governor in Council to investigate, study and report upon a matter of immediate concern, that matter having been assigned to it by the Cabinet of the day.[37]

Royal commissions, originally a British invention, derive their authority from federal or provincial Inquiries Acts in Canada. Such legislation has two purposes: to provide rules which serve to insulate commissions from government interference and to empower commissioners to subpoena witnesses and take evidence given under oath. That the Acts do not specify procedures has an advantage. There is an expectation that a commission will present a written report or reports although there is no legal obligation to do so. Similarly, it is expected that the government will accept a commission's report or reports, sanction release to the public, but it is under no constraint to legislate on any or all of the recommendations set out by the commission.[38]

Unlike the British model, in which recompense for commissioners is minimal, Canadian commissions tend to incur substantial expenses, partly due to the practice of paying the commissioners and consultants. In recent times, commissions have sponsored research projects which thus require funding. Payment of the secretariat, subsidized travel and the printing of the report are fixed costs which cannot be deleted from the budget of commissions.[39]

Commissions are not appointed for a specific period of time and they are not tied to the life of any particular session of the legislature. It is important to note that if a commission spans two different governments, the new government may not suspend the commission. Only on submission of the final report does a commission cease to exist.[40]

With regard to membership, Goulson has reported that educational royal commissions in Canada tend to have fewer members compared with comparable British commissions and to favour chairmen with legal or academic backgrounds.[41] An interesting feature of commissions in the Prairie Provinces has been the appointment of individuals who have served on the executive of groups influential in community life such as parent-school and rural organizations.[42]

Commissioners are selected by the government initiating the commission and their names, including that of the designated chairman, appear in the Order-in-Council. In effect, the Cabinet decision is based on the recommendation of the appropriate Minister who has generally consulted the head of his Department. According to the nature and purposes of the particular commission, criteria for the selection of commissioners relate to one or more of the following: impartiality, representativeness, acknowledged expertise and status as a "public figure." The commissioners' appointments are for the duration of the inquiry. Should a replacement be required, the government will name another person.[43]

The manifest purposes of commissions are dictated by the terms of reference which appear in the Order-in-Council. As the terms must be approved by Cabinet, it follows that these will be consonant with government wishes. The terms of reference are influenced by the objectives held by those responsible for setting up the commission. Wraith and Lamb state that governments build into public investigations certain assumptions by virtue of their right to select the commissioners and the terms of reference.[44] It is possible that the commission's purposes and thus its tasks, will be perceived differently by government and commission members. The corollary of this situation is that a full understanding of a particular commission is possible only if one can check for latent as well as manifest objectives, purposes and functions. In these respects, royal commissions, though institutionalized, tend always to be problematic. Another way in which a commission may be considered problematic is the variety of objectives which may be impelling a government to act to establish a royal commission. With respect to commissions of inquiry into education, Goulson puts forward three such objectives:

> Commissions: (1) . . . may be formed to pave the way for legislative action already decided upon by the Government. This sets the public mind into positive sympathetic motion, (2) . . . Government may be considering an important line of action but it wishes to test and gauge public opinion . . . as a "trial balloon," (3) . . . may just be a painstaking investigation to get a wealth of facts and knowledge which might lead to eventual solution of some important public problems.[45]

BELL-FAST BOND
50% COTTON

The inquiry procedure has become institutionalized through frequent usage. Prior to the commissioners' entry on duty, a secretary is appointed, usually by the permanent head of the department involved in consultation with the chairman of the commission. The initial meetings of the commission therefore will consist of the development of a strategy for operation which requires the co-operation of both commissioners and secretariat. The information input is derived from briefs and other written submissions, the cross-examination from public hearings, the evidence of witnesses called to meetings in camera to expound on specific topics, and the findings of sponsored research, conducted formally—in which case the responsibility is delegated to the research director and consultants where necessary or informally—by the efforts of the commissioners themselves undertaking fact-finding trips or merely studying appropriate literature. Despite the institutionalization of the royal commission in Canadian society, each of the procedures listed tends to be problematic in the sense that alternatives are present and choices are made which contribute to the texture and dynamic of each specific commission that is created.

Upon cessation of collection of evidence, the commission must analyse it, drawing from it the material which will form the substance of its recommendations. In this phase, the commission may or may not receive assistance from "outsiders" and/or the secretariat. The drafting of the recommendations and the writing of the report, which are subject to many details and variations depending on the particular commission, complete the second phase. The commission's work is over once the printed report is submitted to the Lieutenant Governor. It is with his sanction as the representative of the Crown that the report is tabled in the legislature, from which body the content is then released to the public.[46] In what is written in the commission report, the way it is handled, when it is released—also tend to be problematic reflecting choices made among alternatives and inviting the question "why" as well as "what" and "when?".

One of the difficult aspects of institutionalization to deal with analytically is the assessment of consequences of behaviour in institutions, in this case a royal commission. Here the concepts of manifest and latent functions prove helpful. Some idea of the range of functions that may be associated with royal commissions can be gained from the writing of other studies of royal commissions. It is well known that the information-gathering phase of the commission is a lengthy process. Thus a commission may serve as a delaying measure for a government which is faced with an embarrassing political situation. In a similar way, the high visibility of a commission and its formalized procedures may allay the hostility of various pressure groups by providing a forum for open discussion of problems with the possibility of influencing, thereby, government policy. The expression of public feeling which might be construed as an attack, or as a genuine effort to bring information to the attention of the government, is channelled through the commission leaving the government free to pursue other business. Commission findings may act as a certification of facts in a particular issue, thus preparing a sounder basis for later decision-making. The last function is most likely to be a manifest function whereas the previous three would tend to be latent.

Ultimately one must recognise the political nature of royal commissions. In the sense that it is appointed by the government of the day, a commission is inevitably a political instrument. As has been mentioned previously, the decisions respecting membership and terms of reference involve what is, in fact, allocation and distribution of resources. What is not allocated is also significant. Similarly, in the process of taking evidence, the commission may serve as a means of disseminating more widely the views of particular pressure groups. The well-organized and the articulate may derive greater benefit than those groups which constitute part of the problem to be investigated, for example, the poor or disadvantaged minority groups.

At the same time, public inquiries are political in a different sense. They are a form of political education. They inform the people about social and administrative problems through the objective use of exposure in a way that is difficult for formal education and for the mass media. They tend to provide opportunities for participatory democracy and for bringing to bear fresh insights on recurring problems and in eliciting new ideas for their solutions. As a consequence they make a contribution to policy-making which is a third political facet of royal commissions.

Policy-making under the system of democratic government typified by the Canadian provinces tends to be non-anticipatory, that is, it occurs in response to an external condition which exerts pressure on the government for suitable legislation. It follows from this usual orientation that policies are built up in an incrementalist way based on what already exists and what is immediately feasible. For policy to be successful, however, it must gain popularity with the electorate and so must be fashioned to have broad appeal. A final distinguishing feature is in keeping with the others, that consistency does not have a prominent place as a criterion for policy-making. Ad hoc evolution is not conducive to grand designs.[47] This is the ordinary course of policy-making in government.

In the case of royal commissions, however, they are concerned with policy-making too, but in many-faceted ways which frequently transcend the limitations of policy-making of governments in office and their departments, with their concern for political balance and threats to party tenure. The royal commission publicizes, in a detached, informed manner, topics of concern about which both public and government may be ill-informed.[48] Direct informational in-puts, perhaps from new sources and often legitimated by research, are made available in policies recommended to government for implementation. Further, royal commissions often permit the development of insight into a problem which incorporates the views of not one person, party, group or interest but a spectrum of individuals, groups and interests. By its operation and recommendations, the royal commission may place the problem and its solution on a more rational basis, thereby neutralizing opposition and stimulating sound policy. The commission allows the government to explore the possibilities for policy in what might be described as a vicarious manner. The techniques of the commission for data-dredging, the tapping of public opinion, obtaining the reaction of organized groups and so on, give some idea of the acceptable limits of hypothetical policies. The commission's report can act as a reservoir of material for future decision-making.[49] In these and other ways, royal commissions have been highly valued, especially in some sectors of Canadian society, for their varied strategic contributions to policy-making.

To support the above generalization, two brief comments from recent writings on the role of commissions in policy-making serve to draw the present discussion to an appropriate conclusion. Chapman writes:

> Thus commissions not only have the role of appreciating a situation, they also on occasions create a climate for action. They are, as Sir Geoffrey Vickers has said, not only analytic but catalytic.[50]

The assessment of Doern and Aucoin adds a further insight into the relationship of royal commissions and policy.

> Governments use royal commissions both as sources of information for policy-making, as well as to prove the government's concern for improved policy-making . . . "A Royal Commission," Willms notes, "is more effective for the latter purpose than for the former."[51]

The last quotation is an invitation to look at the latent functions of commissions in policy-making.

Evaluation of Source Materials

In order to meet the demands of the theoretical base of the study, a multi-dimensional methodology is required including historical research, systematic analysis of contemporary materials and the use of open-ended interviews. It can be seen, therefore, that the source materials are both documentary and human. The extent of potential data is related to the nature of the phenomenon being researched and to the time lag of sixteen years between the activity of the commission and the carrying out of this study.

Firstly, as a public inquiry established by the legislature of the day, certain documents form part of its "life-history." They include the original Order-in-Council authorising the Commission and listing the chairman, other members and the terms of reference. This document allows one to establish accurately the time of setting up of the commission as well as facts about structure and function of the Commission. Other sources of data predictable from the public nature of the inquiry are the Commission's written report and the ministerial comment and discussion in the Legislature it would generate. Also expected would be reports of subsequent action both within the Legislature and the Department of Education. These materials, which were in part available, provided an idea of the Commission's origin and a précis of the operation of the Commission. The findings and recommendations (the output) and the "official" reaction to the work of the investigation, are important for assessing its effectiveness as an aid in policy-making.

Commissions through their data-seeking procedures accumulate files of information in the form of written briefs and other submissions, transcripts of hearings, research reports and minutes of meetings. There may be in these files some indication of references consulted, conferences attended by members, educational establishments visited and unsolicited evidence. From a sociological point of view this material is crucial for understanding the logistics of the commission, the source and content of informational in-put, the networks of contributing groups and individuals—their statuses and roles, expressed educational ideologies and values. From these data it is possible to examine the overt factors influencing the social distribution of educational knowledge mediated by the commission.

At this juncture, it is helpful to consider the materials available in terms of the often-used research dichotomy, primary and secondary documentary sources. While the Order-in-Council, Commission reports and files and "official" comments are unquestionably primary material important in historical research, secondary source material in the form of written comment about the commission found in books, newspapers, magazines, journals and theses also has a kind of primary documentary status so far as analysis and interpretation of the Commission are concerned. In other words, in this sociological inquiry, it is the way documents can be used in the theoretical models rather than any arbitrary classification that must be of uppermost concern. The discovery of new sociological "facts" and external validity checks both depend on the use of secondary as well as primary sources.

A rather unusual feature of the study is the use of interview data as a means of checking the validity of both primary and secondary sources. The discovery of sociological "facts," the main purpose of the study, as well as external validity checks which are important for craftsmanship of the study both depend on the use of secondary as well as primary sources augmented by interview data. Theoretically, what has just been said is important in that it means that structural-functionalism, sociology of knowledge and phenomenology are played against each other in the quest for reliable knowledge.[52]

Limitations of the Study: Resources and Theories

Attention has been drawn to the fact that there does not appear to be a body of research literature relating to the general topic of the present study. Neither has there been much academic interest in the 1957 Royal Commission. This means that a traditional source of legitimation is absent. A corollary is that the researcher does not have the benefit of an *a priori* acceptance of the theoretical base and methodology to be employed in the study. This is not to say, of course, that such conditions are essential prerequisites for attaining theoretical and practical significance in academic work.

A more specific limitation are the gaps in data relating to the Royal Commission. Extensive inquiries in the Legislative Library, the Provincial Archives, Department of Education Archives, University Libraries have revealed serious deficiences in the material available. Reasons for this range from weaknesses in the information storage and retrieval services of these organizations, inaccessibility because materials cannot yet be released for public use, to absence of practices for collecting and retaining information, for example, Hansard reporting was not a legislative practice in Alberta in the 1950s and 1960s. To a certain degree, interview data and secondary sources helped to overcome these deficiencies, but they were not a complete solution.

A theoretical limitation to the study is related to the newness of ideas about knowledge management in sociology of education.

These had developed primarily in the 1960s and early 1970s. As yet there is no extensive practical application of these ideas to the analysis of educational phenomena such as public inquiries into education systems. The satisfaction, and perhaps security, of evaluating the findings of one's research against comparable work done by others, is not possible. The effect is that while one strives for internal consistency and acuteness of perception in the analysis, the generalizability of conclusions is restricted.

Summary

Chapter two has had the primary task of indicating the interlocking relationship between the assumptions which gave focus to the study and the theoretical base and methodology which subserved the purposes to be achieved by the study. An elaboration of the theoretical basis of the study showed the value of combining the structural-functional, sociology of knowledge and phenomenological perspectives and of augmenting structural-functionalism with collective behaviour theory.

The royal commission as an institution in Canadian society was examined. However, this was done in such a way as to point out that the establishment and features of the royal commission, though institutionalized, are still problematic. Although there are practical limitations of resources and theories to what is being attempted, it might be argued that research such as this has relevance for its "pioneering" function.

Footnotes

[1] I. Funk, ed., New Standard Dictionary of the English Language (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1963), p. 2450.

[2] Ibid., p. 616.

[3] The terminology here is not being applied in the strict sociological sense. The purpose is to convey an orientation towards activity on the part of the researcher in, for example, selecting and interacting with people associated with the Commission. That is, the data collection entails more than analysis of written source materials.

[4] The interviewees according to the position they held at the time of the commission were:

Senator D. Cameron	Chairman of the Commission
Mr. J. Cormack	Commissioner
Mrs. W. Hansen	Commissioner
Dr. G. Mowat	Commissioner
Mrs. I. Taylor	Commissioner
[Mr. N. Douglas	Commissioner (deceased)]
Senator E. Manning	Premier
Dr. W. Swift	Deputy Minister of Education
Mr. A. Aalborg	Minister of Education
Dr. T. Byrne	Chief Superintendent of Schools
Dr. R. Rees	Secretary of the Commission
Dr. R. MacArthur	Research Director of the Commission
Dr. H. Coutts	Dean of Faculty of Education
Dr. S. Clarke	Executive Secretary, Alberta Teachers' Association

[5] M. F. Young, "On the Politics of Educational Knowledge," Economy and Society 1 (1972): 194-215.

[6] G. Caldwell, "Educational Values in Alberta—A Comparison of the Orientations of the Department of Education and Interest Groups" (M.A. thesis, University of Calgary, 1968). The thesis used as data for uncovering held values, various curriculum guides published by the Department of Education in Alberta and group briefs presented to the Cameron Commission on Education in Alberta 1957-1959.

[7] C. Goulson, "An Historical Survey of Royal Commissions and Other Major Governmental Inquiries in Canadian Education" (D.Ed. thesis, University of Toronto, 1966). This thesis concerned itself with questions such as how frequent were royal commissions, the number of commissions, why the investigations were made and how the reports were received.

[8] D. Daloise, "A Study of the Degree of Implementation of Recommendations Pertaining to Organization and Administration made by the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, 1959" (M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1970); G. Maddocks, "A Study of the Degree of Implementation of Recommendations Pertaining to the Supply, Preparation, and Payment of Teachers made by the Alberta Royal Commission on Education, 1959" (M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1970); A. Wilcer, "A Study of the Implementation of Recommendations Pertaining to Control of Education made by the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, 1959" (M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1970). The titles of these theses would seem to explain quite clearly the nature of their content.

[9] M. F. D. Young, ed., *Knowledge and Control* (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), p. 3. This perspective is characteristic of the new-wave sociologists of education, especially in Britain.

[10] Based on Willer's usage of the term knowledge:

> "A system of knowledge is nothing more than a set of ideas about the nature of the world and the relationships in it. Individual explanations of events will differ according to the different systems of knowledge."

See J. Willer, *The Social Determination of Knowledge* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 18.

[11] The range of ideas included in this section represent an amalgam from the articles of Ioan Davies, "The Management of Knowledge," and Basil Bernstein, "On the Classification and Framing of Knowledge," in *Knowledge and Control*, ed. Michael Young (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), pp. 267-284 and pp. 47-68 respectively; and Dennis Smith's paper, "Power, Ideology, and the Transmission of Knowledge," in *Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems*, ed. Earl Hopper (London: Hutchinson, 1971), pp. 240-261.

[12] N. Smelser, *Theory of Collective Behavior* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 23.

[13] B. Bernstein, op. cit., p. 47.

[14] These ideas are characteristic of Schutzian phenomenology generally and two specific references can be cited: A. Schutz, *Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality*, ed. M. Natanson (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962), pp. 9-19; and Idem, *Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory*, ed. A. Brodersen (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964), p. 124.

[15] E. Crawford, "The Informal Organization of Policy-Oriented Social Science," in *Social Scientists and International Affairs*, eds. E. Crawford and A. Biderman (New York: John Wiley, 1969), p. 75.

[16] Taken from an article by O. Duncan and L. Schnore, "Cultural, Behavioral, and Ecological Perspectives in the Study of Social Organisation," American Journal of Sociology 65 (1959): 132-146.

[17] E. Crawford and A. Biderman, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

[18] The intention of this paragraph was to express as simply and briefly as possible, one feature of the phenomenological orientation which relates to the methodology of the study. It cannot be overemphasised that the researcher is aware that this is only a partial explanation even of this one feature. However the purpose will have been served if the interviews do reveal the subjective interpretations of the subjects involved, a dimension not obtained by other techniques in the methodology. The statement given will be recognized as typically Schutzian and is derived from a range of works, the writings of Schutz himself and commentators on his ideas. Selected examples include the three volumes of Collected Papers by Alfred Schutz, (details given in the bibliography) and articles such as those by A. Gurwitsch, "The Commonsense World as a Social Reality," Social Research 29 (1962): 50-72; and B. Hindness, "The Phenomenological Sociology of Alfred Schutz," Economy and Society 1 (1972): 1-27.

[19] E. Crawford and A. Biderman, op. cit., p. 17.

[20] A. Blum, "The Corpus of Knowledge as a Normative Order," in Knowledge and Control, ed. by M. F. D. Young (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), p. 118.

[21] These ideas are to be found in Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1936) and are placed in their social context by Louis Wirth in his lengthy Introduction to the book.

[22] T. Bottomore, "Some Reflections on the Sociology of Knowledge," British Journal of Sociology 7 (1956): 56.

[23] K. Mannheim, op. cit., pp. 266-267.

[24] This trend is exemplified by the chapters contributed by these sociologists in M. F. D. Young, ed., Knowledge and Control (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971).

[25] D. Cartwright, "Influence, Leadership, Control," in Handbook of Organizations, ed. J. G. March (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 28-31. Abbreviated definitions have been included:

> "Reward power: relates to the ability to mediate rewards; coercive power is the ability to mediate punishment; referent power is based on a feeling of oneness or identification; legitimate power stems from internalized values of the rightness to exert power and expert power is related to some special knowledge or expertness."

[26] See Chapter 2, "Contextuality: Mapping the Social and Decision Process," in H. Laswell, A Pre-View of Policy Sciences (New York: American Elsevier, 1971), pp. 14-33.

[27] Ibid., pp. 28-30. A concise form of Lasswell's power outcomes has been included:

> "The intelligence outcome includes the gathering, processing and dissemination of information . . . promotional outcomes add agitational intensity to the dissemination of a value demand . . . prescription outcomes are characterized by the stabilization of expectations concerning the norms to be severely sanctioned if challenged . . . invocation is the act of characterizing a concrete situation in terms of its conformity or nonconformity to prescription . . . application is the final characterization of concrete circumstances in terms of prescriptions . . . termination cancels a prescription and deals with the claims put forward by those who acted in good faith when the prescriptions were in effect . . . the appraisal outcomes characterize the aggregate flow of decision according to the policy objectives of the body politic, and identify those who are causally or formally responsible for successes or failures."

Note that Lasswell's general paradigm for social process in policy science from which the above model was taken, p. 19, is applicable to the analysis of a royal commission. However, the application and use are beyond the scope of this study.

[28] D. Walsh, "Sociology and the Social World," in P. Filmer et al., New Directions in Sociological Theory (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1972), p. 20.

[29] P. Cohen, Modern Social Theory (London: Heinemann, 1968), p. 14. Cohen provides a sophisticated analysis of the functional or holistic theories of Durkheim, Radcliffe-Brown, Malinowski and Parsons. Further, he gives a critique of the doctrine based on logical, substantive and ideological grounds. A useful analysis of structure and structuralism is found in Guy Rocher, A General Introduction to Sociology: A Theoretical Perspective (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1972), pp. 283-293.

[30] Quoted in Guy Rocher, op. cit., p. 282.

[31] B. Barber, "Structural-Functional Analysis: Some Problems and Misunderstandings," American Sociological Review 21 (1956): 130.

[32] R. K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, enlarged ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1968), p. 105. Because of the different usages of "function" which can lead to confusion, Merton's definitions have been included in the body of the text.

[33] I. Davies, in Knowledge and Control, ed. M. F. D. Young, pp. 272-273.

[34] O. Duncan and L. Schnore, op. cit., p. 135.

[35] N. Smelser, op. cit., p. 23.

[36] Ibid., pp. 15-17.

[37] G. Henderson, *Federal Royal Commissions in Canada 1867-1966: A Checklist* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), p. xi.

[38] Based on a discussion of commissions and reforms in Canadian education in F. Johnson, *A Brief History of Canadian Education* (Toronto: McGraw Hill, 1968), pp. 168-169.

[39] G. Henderson, op. cit., p. xv.

[40] C. Hanser, *Guide to Decision: The Royal Commission* (New Jersey: The Bedminster Press, 1965), p. 37.

[41] C. Goulson, op. cit., p. 7, p. 504.

[42] Ibid.

[43] C. Hanser, op. cit., pp. 38-39.

[44] R. Wraith and G. Lamb, *Public Inquiries as an Instrument of Government* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1971), p. 340. It is not suggested that negative inferences are to be drawn from this comment. The intent is to caution against a too simplistic interpretation of the genesis of commissions.

[45] C. Goulson, op. cit., p. 8.

[46] The material for this section was derived from a number of sources: books such as R. Chapman, ed., *The Role of Commissions in Policy-Making* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1973); personal interviews conducted with some of the commissioners and the secretary of the Alberta Royal Commission on Education in May and June of 1974; and information obtained from the Legislative Library in the form of reports from newspapers at the time of the 1957-1959 Commission's operation contained in the "Newspaper Hansards."

[47] A more detailed discussion of these points with supporting evidence is given in G. Doern and P. Aucoin, op. cit., pp. 116-118.

[48] A suggestion made by H. Clokie and J. Robinson, *Royal Commissions of Inquiry* (New York: Octagon Books, 1969), p. 217.

[49] Derived particularly from the writings of Chapman, op. cit., pp. 184-187; and Doern and Aucoin, op. cit., pp. 118-126.

[50] R. Chapman, op. cit., p. 187.

[51] G. Doern and P. Aucoin, op. cit., p. 118.

[52] An examination of the explanatory footnotes for various chapters, the bibliography which has been classified for greater convenience and materials contained in the appendices give an indication of the nature and extent of the "literature" that is, sources of material, upon which this study is based.

CHAPTER III

THE SOCIO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE CAMERON COMMISSION

Introduction

The inclusion of a chapter on the socio-historical context of the Cameron Commission is justified on two grounds. Theoretically, the structural-functional perspective emphasizes recognition of a society as a series of systems interlocking in many different ways. Each system fulfils some function for every other system and thus contributes to the cohesion of the society as a whole. Knowledge of the constraints on a system, from those systems external to it, is essential in understanding the adaptations of the particular system in both its structure and function over time. Although of less importance to some theorists, it is nevertheless an additional feature of structural-functional analysis to have an awareness of pre-institutional behaviour, creativity and conflict within a system.[1] For this reason, a collective behaviour perspective has been included. On a more pragmatic level, S. D. Clark has cautioned that the good sociologist does not neglect the historical dimension otherwise he will be left with a static view which ignores social change.[2] The Cameron Commission, though a specialized system designed with a limited life-span, cannot be seen in isolation from other systems particularly those of the polity, education, religion, the economy and the family.

It is important to clarify the purpose of this chapter. The major thrust is sociological not historical. The historian is concerned to describe past events, indicating how and why they occurred when they did—linking a particular combination of personalities and circumstances, but the sociologist's objective is to discern sociological generalizations from a study of historical phenomena—that is, to explain events by reference to groups, their characteristics and interactions in playing out their social roles. Therefore, the material in this chapter is arranged to highlight those features which are of sociological significance and interest. Some detail, essential to the work of the historian, will be absent or treated briefly.

With respect to the structure of the chapter, the first part will comprise a general discussion on selected social changes and developments in Alberta from its inception as a province to the early sixties, relating these to the total Canadian context where appropriate. This will be followed by an examination of some of the societal institutions to draw out points of particular relevance for education and to illustrate their interdependence. A survey of some of the more significant changes and developments in Albertan education for the period will follow. The Commission itself will then be placed in its socio-historical context. Within this historical context, an effort will be made to identify some of the factors contributing to the emergence of the Commission.

One should note that Albertan history seems to fall naturally into three periods: the pioneering phase—from the time of the North-West Territories settlement to the time of adjustment after the First

World War; from the coming to power of the first indigenous political party in the early 1920s to the close of the Second World War—reflecting the predominantly agricultural phase, and the post-war period—with marked urbanization and industrialization linked with the exploitation of a diversity of natural resources. The survey of social forces operating in society generally, and with respect to education specifically, will tend to follow this time pattern.

Social Changes and Developments in Alberta to the 1960s

The Pioneer Phase to the Early Twenties

The opening up of Western Canada for settlement which was begun and directed by the East has been referred to as the last "national experiment" of this country.[3] Once the initial endeavours in agriculture were undertaken, the promise of land was sufficient to attract an increasing flow of immigrants from other parts of Canada and from overseas. This brought growing numbers of the so-called "Third Element"[4] into the population and subsequently, new languages, new customs, new ideas, that is, new cultures to mingle with an established English-French biculturalism. In the wake of the people came facilities like the railways, developments in agricultural techniques, opening up of new urban concentrations with the consequent expansion of urban occupations.

The new province was not given an uninterrupted period in which to consolidate its gains. Alberta's involvement in the First World War resulted in the loss of many of its young men and yet provided an expansive market for its agricultural products. Prosperity induced in this way was rather precarious in the immediate post-war period. Thus the grievances against the East which had not diminished, the labour troubles, the distrust of traditional political parties, the upheaval over votes for women, prohibition, the influence of reform movements in the American West and the general Progressive Movement in Canada, led to a ferment which resulted in the entry of a specific occupational group into politics. In 1921 the new party, The United Farmers of Alberta, took charge of the province's government. Even at this early stage, Alberta, while sharing certain traits in common with the rest of Canada, exhibited sociological differences.

To illustrate this point a little further: a dominant theme in Canada's history has been the mobility of the population. The ebb and flow has been governed especially by discoveries of natural resources and by technological changes which have set up new demands for labour in different places and at different times.[5] Migration occurs in and out of the country, from province to province, more usually in the direction of country to city, between cities and within local communities and metropolitan areas.[6] Alberta has exhibited all of these forms of migration but to varying degrees. In times of bad harvest and severely unfavourable weather conditions those on sub-marginal land have been forced to leave—perhaps to another country, "down East" where the industrial job market was more resilient, to new arable land (as happened with the Peace River development), or to the nearest town or city. However, certain ethnic and religious groups have set up bloc settlements or colonies and even with the very same conditions, the groups have maintained their solidarity and position. The integration of the group sustained them against adversity. At the same time, community cohesion in towns and rural districts was slow to develop because of the exclusiveness and segregation of group life which limited social intercourse.[7]

As another contrast, Morton has characterized the Canadian spirit of the twenties as a mixture of three elements resulting in a sort of false consciousness to maintain the link with an era which had virtually disappeared.

> The elements of the Canadian nostalgia were a Christianity essentially missionary in impulse and rural in assumption, a rural conservatism that was materialistic, even primitive, and committed to simple living and moral endurance, beneath both of these an unthinking individualism, essentially optimistic in spirit.[8]

Particularly in those eastern provinces where urbanization and industrialization had become well-established by this time, the outlook quoted was perpetuated as something of a myth. With what might be termed cultural lag operating in the West because social organization had not reached the same level of complexity, the expression represented reality for many Albertans.

The Agricultural Phase to 1945

The thirties in Canada were ushered in by the world depression which had appeared precipitately, so it seemed, with the stockmarket crash of 1929. In federal politics the Conservative Government led by R. B. Bennett had assumed power. In this decade "Canadians sought a new definition of national purpose."[9] In Alberta, with the Wheat Pool facing bankruptcy, the dangerously low level of farm prices, mass unemployment, malnutrition, the aggravation of severe drought, what the people felt was the old bitterness of betrayal and exploitation.[10] The almost total economic collapse of the prairies undermined the whole national economy, with effects in commerce, industry, banking and transportation.[11]

The Progressive Movement which had failed at the federal level by this time, remained strong in the Western provinces. A second experiment in direct democracy was initiated when the Social Credit Party with William Aberhart the new premier, swept out the United Farmers of Alberta at the 1935 election in Alberta.[12] The promise of the "basic dividend" and the "just price" combined with a fundamentalist evangelism offered hope when all rational solutions seemed to have failed. McNaught explains the distinctive political behavior in Alberta in the following way:

> The astonishing political unity exhibited by Albertans can best be explained by the homogeneity of their social-economic structure. A society of more-or-less independent primary producers, the majority of people in the province constituted a sort of rural petite bourgeoisie with an identical interest in loosening credit facilities and defending themselves against national protective policies that favoured the industralized region in central Canada . . . .[13]

The thirties clearly illustrated the intimate relation of the various societal institutions both in Alberta and in Canada generally. The agricultural bias in provincial life was still predominant. Another feature of significance was the presence in the Legislature, for the first time, of Alberta-born members. The Depression had an inertial effect not only on the economy but on the population as well. The province seemed to stagnate; Social Credit policies in many cases were abortive and without the intervention of a second world conflict, it is interesting to speculate what political course Alberta would have taken next. The tightening of social bonds, with the need to co-operate fully in time of war, masked the strains and dysfunctions of a society on the verge of radical social change. One of the effects of the war was to intensify the forces influential in change.

The Urbanization and Industrialization Phase to the Early 1960s

> The post-war years were essentially an extension of the period of economic growth initiated by the war, and as usual, prosperity brought contentment and political stability.[14]

Such a statement cannot be put to the test in Alberta, for the oil boom burst on the province in 1947 during the readjustment stage. The oil industry and its subsidiaries stimulated a range of processes including urbanization, industrialization, technological change and consumerism. These processes had been operative to a more advanced degree in Eastern Canada prior to the 1940s. Other developments in Canada such as the press for improved highways, medical and welfare services, educational systems, communications, and defence were reflected in Alberta on a smaller scale now that personal and provincial financial resources had been so dramatically strengthened.[15]

Into the fifties, Alberta experienced a further phase of extensive population growth, including another "American invasion."[16] Post-war immigration also added to Alberta's distinctiveness among the provinces because it received a greater proportion of political refugees just after the war than most other regions. These migrants had a strong desire to remain in Canada, to become Canadians and moreover, to improve their own social standing by hard work. They aspired even higher for their children via education.[17] The criteria for social stratification were no longer so clearly-defined. The Canada-wide trend for rapid increase in size and complexity of cities with redistribution of population and population increase were observable in the expansion of Calgary and Edmonton.[18] Calgary became the centre for the financial, geological and operating aspects of the petrochemical industry while Edmonton was the refining centre and exhibited strong diversification in other industrial and manufacturing ventures ranging from edible oils, chemical and fertilizer plants to cement and pipe factories.[19]

The fifties appeared to be a time of prosperity and civil peace, with little societal change. However, there was latent a tension between the pragmatic-materialistic orientation and the idealistic-Judeo-Christian orientation.[20] People wanted a share in the new affluence and stability—new life styles—after two decades of depression and war. On the other hand, there was some unease that this might lead to moral decay, perhaps lack of character in the younger generation. The dialectic, often unrecognised, which was generated by this tension found its outlet in divergent forms including criticism of public education, discussions on the generation gap, a turning back to religion with a desire to infuse more religious values into everyday life. The concept of the Canadian "mosaic" had to be balanced against the idea of full assimilation. Commitment to individual values such as success and security had to be integrated with loyalty to group norms arising from the variety of secondary groups to which the individual belonged, for example business, church, ethnic, cultural.[21] Perhaps this philosophical conflict combined with the ad hoc and improvised nature of much of the change and development which occurred up to the close of the 1950s may help to explain the tension and open conflict in Canadian society in the decade that followed.

Institutions in Alberta

The Family

The family can be thought of as a network of human relationships structured to meet the needs of its members. The older members secure the physical and emotional welfare of the young by catering for survival needs such as food and shelter and providing opportunities for primary group experience. The family has played a crucial role in the development of Alberta. It has been the key stabilizing force in a society exhibiting a low degree of integration. The support of the family group was an essential component in encouraging the pioneer settler, the immigrant, the dispossessed farmer of the Depression, the drifters to the cities.

In the pioneer era of the province, the family had to accept a large measure of responsibility for religious, health, educational and cultural functions. The co-operation of the whole family in the farming enterprise was a characteristic of the agricultural phase, even with the trend to farm mechanization and of population shift to urban areas. In the post-war period, perhaps structure and function of families have become less distinct with an increase in divorce, illegitimacy, the evolution of new mores concerning limitation on births, the stress on materialistic values favouring the working wife.[22] The accelerated process of relinquishing many of the family's former functions to specialized societal agencies has contributed to an apparent diminution in family influence. Larson's review of available published and unpublished research data of relevance to family life in Alberta is a fruitful source of information on facets of the Albertan family in general.[23] Selected vital statistics and related family characteristics for the differing census divisions are of particular interest.[24] The rate of natural increase in Alberta reached a maximum in the 1950s and thereafter began to decline. Divorce rates, number of illegitimate births, length of life for males and females have all increased since the 1930s. Proportionately, urban Alberta has more unmarried persons, less two- or three-family households and fewer children than rural Alberta. Married women comprise a larger share of the labour force than single women. Most women have completed childbearing by the age of thirty.

To illustrate the diversity of family characteristics in Alberta, Larson's research summary of the highest and lowest for various census districts should be consulted. For example, Drumheller had the lowest divorce rate whereas Red Deer and Calgary had high divorce rates. Grande Prairie had a high proportion of French and Indians in its population, high birth and illegitimacy rates while Edmonton had the highest number of households with a female only head. The Edson census district had the lowest marriage rate while in Fort MacLeod it was unusually high.[25]

With respect to education, the literature in the sociology of education for North America, Britain and other Western countries is amply supplied with studies examining the interrelationship of education and the family. There is a vast store of material on differential life chances and opportunity for education, effect of family characteristics on school learning and reasons for the "drop-out" phenomenon, among many others, and it can be assumed that some of the generalizations would be applicable to Alberta.[26] To illustrate, the children of professional families have more opportunity for a university education, Indian children have less chance of completing a high school course than white children of approximately the same socio-economic status, rural children have restricted formal education experiences compared with city children.[27] It is clear that education and family are highly interrelated especially in the elementary and secondary school years, but many of these relationships will be as complex as the diversity to be found among the characteristics of families themselves.

The feature of the family-school relationship which has had the most striking impact in Alberta has been that of sheer numbers. Every Education Department Report of the fifties and up to the mid-sixties drew attention to the increase in enrolment figures and associated with that, accelerated school building programmes and the teacher shortage. In the late sixties and on, the "bulge" has been reflected in the tertiary sector. Therefore, education is influenced directly by the numbers of children produced by families and by the taxes paid in support of school districts and indirectly, by ideas, attitudes and values held by parents which often determine opportunities for education and which are transmitted to children affecting their performance in school and their educational aspirations and expectations for later life.

Religion

According to Clark:

> The religious development of Canada . . . offers a convincing demonstration of the importance of the religious interest in securing a sense of social solidarity, of society. The religious institution as an integral part of the whole institutional complex of the community served as one of the means of entering into social relationships and of becoming a part of recognized group life.[28]

Alberta's history indicates certain barriers to developing community consciousness. The waves of immigration leading to a large number and range of ethnic and religious groups, cycles of economic depression and prosperity, and shifting distribution of settlement were more conducive to a loosely integrated structure with a large marginal social element among the population.[29] Religious development in Alberta has been of great interest to social scientists because of its exceptional history of non-conformity with the appearance and activity of sects in competition with the established churches. Mann has indicated that:

> Alberta attracted attention not only by the variety of its religious groupings but also by the influential role which sectarian religion had played in political and social developments.[30]

The beginnings of religion in the region preceded the establishment of the province in 1905. Missionaries of the major churches had accompanied the explorers, furtraders, and pioneer farmers to the North-West Territories. Their interest in hospitals and schools as well as the moral welfare of the population ensured the place of the religious institution as population grew and society became more complex. With a continuing influx of settlers, the balance between French Roman Catholics and English Protestants altered. This was reflected in the abandonment of a dual system of education in favour of a public non-sectarian system with provision for the protection of minority rights. (One must recognize the struggle which was necessary here to resist the attempt of the Laurier Government to enforce establishment of a separate system on the new province.[31])

The new province therefore inherited a system of public and separate schools with allowance for religious instruction in both, and it was not until considerably later that private denominational schools received assistance from public funds. The Protestant churches, in general, have embraced the concept of a public system open to all. With the appearance of evangelical sects, it is interesting to note that they have shown little interest in setting up their own schools. Their influence has been felt more in the private schools for the training of lay and professional religious leaders. Perhaps also, the religious groups have had a greater force in informal educational ways, through social reform, Sabbath observance, youth work and the temperance movement.[32]

The thirties and forties, times of depression and war, gave a pronounced impetus to the visibility and influence of fundamentalist sects. The most outstanding example is that of the association of the Social Credit Party and its leaders with the Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute. The characteristics of the "sect" in contrast to the "church" seemed to have had much more to offer those oppressed and alienated by society at that time; the denominations tended to serve the interests of the established social classes. These features included an ascetic morality, a protest against the ritual and hierarchical organization of conventional religions and an emphasis on lay participation and equality of members.[33] William Aberhart was able to establish a strong link between the economic and spiritual needs of the people: a return to the comfort of a simple faith in both religion and the monetary policies of Social Credit. This provided an outlet for the grievances of the "marginals" who saw only exploitation in the wealthy churches and organizations with financial power, the banks and big businesses particularly in the eastern provinces. Mann has described the influence of the fundamentalist movement as reactionary—against the forces of urbanism, cultural maturity and economic and religious centralization and decentralizing—as a corrective to economic forces of urbanization, centralization and uniformity which tried to distort underlying traditions and symbolic systems.[34]

The interaction between education and religion in Alberta has tended to favour the State rather than the Church as having prime responsibility for public education. However, the claims of the Church have not been overlooked when one notes: the provision for separate and private schools, the place of religion in the curriculum of all schools, although optional in public schools, the call, as late as 1966, for courses in ethics and morals to be taught in public schools,[35] the objections which have been sustained in some places against the teaching of evolution in school science courses and the request on the part of the Roman Catholic Church in 1958 via the Royal Commission on Education, for what amounted to a dual system of schooling and teacher training.

The Economy

The economy is concerned with the fundamental problem of allocation of scarce resources among the many possible uses. The functions served by the economic institution include the satisfaction of individual needs—food, clothing, shelter; the provision of culturally defined wants and expectations—owning a car, sending children to university and the production of resources for attaining collective goals—defence, education, welfare. From another point of view, the economy supplies the work contexts in which man is socialized beyond the level reached through the agencies of the family, school and the church. To highlight features of the Albertan economy, one must take note of a number of trends including the nature of the economic base, the exploitation of natural resources, demographic change, division of labour and specialization, cycles of prosperity and depression.

For almost fifty years Alberta was regarded as primarily an agricultural province. With an economy highly dependent on agriculture,however, there was an inherent instability due to the effects of bad weather and price and market fluctuations on rural products and thus income.[36] As a consequence, other facets of development were affected, for example, extension of railways, building construction, immigration and the equilibrium of the labour market. The predominantly rural population exerted a conservative influence in religion, politics and education. An examination of the great depression of the thirties shows the dependence of the province on healthy agricultural markets and the weak position of the West vis-a-vis the financial control of the East. A political party with strong roots in fundamental religion was accepted, and its policy on administration of education made changes which had not been able to be made by the United Farmers' government in its fourteen years in office.

In the period 1931-1956, however, the agricultural pattern changed with a new concept of farming. The economic conditions encouraged the development of large-scale farming with a consequent change in small rural communities. The population became even more sparsely distributed while production rose with mechanization and other improved farming methods. The ethos of the rural way of life was to disappear along with many small communities whose services had subsisted on the patronage of the local farmers. With the increase in numbers of hard-surfaced roads, nearby towns and cities became more accessible and the loss of rural youth to the urban centres was sufficient to ensure stagnation in many rural districts.[37]

From 1949 Alberta witnessed a dramatic transformation in its economic base such that few areas of life remain untouched. The growth in manufacturing, mining and construction burgeoned with the discovery of extensive oil and gas resources. Just as the arable land in Alberta had supported the bulk of the population for a half century, now the population was swollen by workers for the oil industry. The increase was to be a permanent one, however, with the continued discovery of oil and the requirements of its refining, and also the setting up of many related industries and manufactures. Other results were the acceleration in the shift of population from rural areas to urban areas and the concentration of the population in Edmonton and Calgary, the rapid pace of commercial and building activity in the major centres and the unprecedented rise in revenues experienced by the provincial government leading to abundant resources for cultural and educational projects and the liquidation of the provincial debt.[38]

Hanson has commented:

> The full impact of the oil discoveries on the Alberta economy has yet to be measured. The economic base of the province has been transformed by the injection of a highly developed petroleum and natural gas industry and of industries such as the petrochemical based on oil and natural gas. . . . the economy has become larger, more diversified, more complex . . . Agriculture . . . has declined in relative importance . . . Personal income of Albertans rose . . . Population decline . . . imminent by 1946 arrested . . . In ten years from 1945 Alberta became more urban than rural.[39]

Education and the economy are interdependent to a marked extent; but one must guard against viewing the association as a mechanistic relationship.[40] The financial needs of public education in some ways expand and contract with the state of the economy as shown in the pre and post oil era in Alberta. Periods of depression in the economy usually affect school enrolment; during the thirties in Alberta, the school enrolment rose to a level not reached again until the decade of the fifties.[41] High birth rate eras also cause expenditures on education to rise; for instance, in Alberta since 1945, the yearly expenditure on education has doubled every five years.[42]

Another link in the interrelation of education and the economy, is the demand made by the education system on the pool of skilled labour. Education is a labour-intensive industry and recruits a substantial proportion of the school leavers into further education in preparation for teaching. Any increase in teacher salaries places a significant strain on public expenditure. In a decentralized system, the financing of education is shared at least three ways by provincial and municipal funding with some assistance from federal sources. Changes in population distribution with respect to numbers and to age group, level of unemployment, the ratio of industrial to residential areas, the strength of the competition from other sectors of the economy such as health and welfare are all factors to be considered in this context.

As Hanson has indicated:

> There has been a long and sustained period of economic growth in Alberta which has induced expansion of the educational system, encouraged investment in education to ensure future economic growth, and provided the means for financing education expenditure requirements.[43]

The Polity

The term polity connotes both politics and government. Polity defined quite simply is society's way of legitimising the use of force. The main function of the polity is to make adjustments between the other institutions of society so as to integrate them and at the same time to facilitate the successful performance of their specialized functions. The outstanding feature of this institution for most of Alberta's history has been the electorate's willingness to support virtually a one-party government for an extended period, then with the rise of another grass-roots movement, to sweep it away to political obscurity.[44] One of the results of such a situation is the possibility that legislation which may not be favoured by many of the people, nevertheless passes unchallenged because of the absence of a viable opposition party in the Legislature. To illustrate, in 1936 the newly elected Premier and Minister for Education, William Aberhart, was able to introduce legislation on the large unit of administration where efforts by the previous government had failed. There was still opposition in some quarters but the Social Crediters resounding electoral victory gave them such control that the legislation passed into the implementation stage with ease. The party held fifty-seven out of sixty-three seats in the Legislature.[45]

The province was guided by a Liberal administration from its inception until 1921 when the agrarian movement of protest and reform, part of the general Progressive Movement of the time, gained sufficient momentum to overturn the two-party system and to bring in a party which overtly represented the predominant social group in the province. As an illustration, by 1920 the membership of the United Farmers of Alberta was about 30,000.[46] This was brought about in part because the small, homogeneous electoral divisions were able to exert more direct pressure on the government and also the movement

BELL-FAST BOND

was part of a larger expression of dissatisfaction which had been growing in the West for some years.[47] However, once in power and with changing conditions, paid-up membership of the United Farmers' party seriously declined. The politically unsophisticated party had to overcome the legacy of the previous government and cope with fluctuating economic conditions as the decade progressed. The great depression and drought of the thirties was beyond solution by the farmer group; debt and unemployment were intransigent problems. In despair, the people turned to a promise of salvation and the monthly dividend. The United Farmers of Alberta lost every seat at the 1935 election. Social Credit reflected the revolutionary temper of the times.

Irving has explained the rise of Social Credit as a social movement which was generated by a period of widespread social unrest and intense dissatisfaction with the existing social order.[48] The people were exceptionally receptive to the apparent "Utopia" presented to them. The philosophy of Social Credit in Alberta was presented within a context of Christian fundamentalism and Bible prophecy. Thus the political movement was in many ways an extension of a firmly-established religious movement. The one-party administration of the Farmers' government, the organization of interest groups in all electorates, the decay of the Farmers' political popularity and platform, all prepared the way for the new Social Credit Movement, but without the charisma of Aberhart, it is problematic that the movement would have achieved such an enormous following of people from every stratum in Albertan society.

> The Social Credit movement in Alberta was essentially a people's movement which sought to reform, but not to revolutionize, the existing social order by changing the existing pattern of certain institutions. Stages of its rise to political power [are] social unrest, popular excitement, formalization, institutionalization. [It] exhibited in the course of its evolution, the mechanisms of agitation, esprit de corps, morale, ideology, and operating tactics.[49]

These two experiments in popular democracy, the governments of the United Farmers and of Social Credit, well exemplify the interlocking of the political, economic and religious institutions within a particular societal framework. The framework was that of a Western province, dominated by primary industry, which had remained isolated geographically and culturally from the remainder of the country for approximately the first half century of its existence.[50]

An important concern for the Alberta polity is education. In Canada, the legislative role in education was reserved for the provincial governments by Section 93 of the British North America Act. There was also included a guarantee that safeguarded the rights of religious minorities. Thus public control of education was early established in the history of the country.[51]

The provincial government decrees the period of compulsory education for all children, minimum standards for school buildings, the basic programme to be taught by teachers with qualifications of a certain standard. It is involved in the financing of schools directly by some form of grant system and indirectly by the creation of local education areas to which are delegated responsibilities to be undertaken by the local authorities for the areas. A member of the provincial cabinet is the minister for education and he has charge of a department of education which implements government policy with respect to education.[52] This general picture of the polity in Canada applies to each province, in this case, the province of Alberta.

By its power to define priorities in public spending, the polity is an external constraint on the educational activities of the province. It also plays a leading part in adjusting the interaction between the institution of education and other societal institutions. Because of its legal monopoly over education, the polity inevitably tends to be placed in the dominating, entrenched role, thereby placing persons and agencies seeking educational change in the assertive, challenging role.[53] The consequence is that the polity is the major agency of social control in matters pertaining to education.

Changes and Developments in Alberta Education to the 1960s

The Pioneer Phase to the Early 1920s

It was in the Territorial period 1884-1905 that the precedents were established for the education system inherited by Alberta on its establishment as a separate province. The changes and developments were related to the need to make provision for a population scattered over an immense area and to accommodate the religious divisions in the Territories. Having tried the schemes operating in the East, Haultain supplied the drive required to achieve the statutory framework for a public, non-sectarian elementary and secondary school system.[54]

Alberta was declared a province on September 1, 1905. The Alberta Act guaranteed the educational rights of religious minorities so that the separate system became a permanent part of the educational pattern in Alberta. The province was fortunate in commencing its existence with many schools already in operation; in 1905 there were 917 schools, 41,033 pupils, 1,129 teachers and the Territorial grants amounted to $239,380.[55]

The years 1905-1913 were occupied in keeping pace with societal change. Immigration was ensuring rapid population increase and diversifying the original ethnic-religious "mix." There was an increasing need to consider assimilation of non-English speaking immigrants. The numbers of schools, mainly of the one-room type, rose as did expenditure.[56] A significant change occurred in 1913 when the Alberta Legislature gave statutory approval to the consolidated school movement. This was an attempt to overcome the deficiencies of the small rural school districts.[57] Consolidation was the first solution advanced to provide a higher education for the rural student while allowing the student to live at home. This organization was the prototype of the present centralized school within a division or county which is able to serve a larger area because of vans or buses, better roads and more money.[58]

The years of World War I seemed to have little effect on Albertan schools with the exception of teacher supply which suffered inevitable disruption. The compulsory school leaving age was raised from fourteen to fifteen years at this time.[59]

The next administrative move of note was the rural high school experiment 1921-1938. This was a reflection of the recognition that whether rural youth remained in the country or moved to the city, high school education was becoming a necessity. The United Farmers' government, conscious of the need for improvement in rural education, implemented The Secondary Consolidated School Act so that nineteen school districts were set up on this pattern. For many reasons, including the fear of incurring greater taxation, lack of qualified teachers and inadequate living accommodation for pupils, the rural high school experiment remained a bridge between the advanced thinking of a few and the time when large school divisions could be permanently established.[60]

Thus education in the pioneering phase was concerned with finding ways of overcoming the physical problems of isolated settlements, limited resources and a population increasing in numbers and heterogeneity. There was an inevitable concentration on developing adequate administrative arrangements. The deficiencies of the small school district soon became apparent. The aims of education emphasized intellectual development, by which was meant providing pupils with a body of traditional knowledge but concern was also expressed that aesthetic, character and citizenship training should not be neglected. In curriculum, the first provincial revision occcurred in 1912-1914 and resulted in the adoption of eight grades rather than five standards in the public school. The grades above eight became the high school. There were additions to the curriculum such as civics, manual training, household science and physical culture. In this period public education reflected the increasing complexity of the society in which it was embedded.[61]

The Agricultural Phase to the Mid-1940s

The failure of the consolidated movement merely served to underline the weaknesses of the small rural district. The most serious according to Jonason were restricted educational opportunities, inadequate instructional programmes and classroom supervision, unsatisfactory taxation support, costly operation and frequent teacher change.[62] Therefore, the major administrative change of this phase was the introduction of the large unit of administration by the new Social Credit government in 1936. Jonason's study of 1951 sought to appraise the achievements of the scheme which had been in operation from 1936. Some of his more important conclusions revealed the improvement in equalization of educational opportunity and quality and degree of classroom supervision; long and short range planning were based more soundly; security of tenure, better salaries and living conditions had produced greater stability in the teaching profession. Although there was substantial opposition to the large unit arrangement at the time of its introduction, by 1951 there was a reversal of this trend.[63]

However, administrative changes were not the only legacy of the agricultural period. School enrolments increased even with little population expansion, one reflection of depression conditions. The secondary sphere received particular attention as the idea that all should benefit by a high school education gained popular acceptance. The status and professional recognition of teachers was improved by the setting up of what became known as the Alberta Teachers' Association. Further gains were made with the transfer of all teacher training to the Faculty of Education in the University of Alberta by 1945.[64] The study of education made by a standing committee of the Legislature in 1934 contained proposals which anticipated educational developments for the succeeding twenty-five years. Work was begun as early as 1936 on a complete revision of the elementary programme with the introduction of the enterprise system, an adaptation of the progressive movement in education which was in the process of being diffused from the United States.[65]

The changes in education in Alberta should not be dissociated from the curricular reforms occurring across Canada. Some of the innovations included the introduction of a junior high school level giving the 6:3:3 pattern of organization, recognition and provision for individual differences, an increasing emphasis on shopwork, art, and home economics as well as the introduction of "activity" programmes with the principle of "learning by doing." The traditional alienation of the West, however, made it easier for Alberta to seek assistance from the United States and the province became a leader in the dissemination of the new practices.[66] (This is not to dispute the argument that Ontario exerted a damping influence on innovation at variance with traditional education as institutionalized in that province.) From 1936 to the end of the War, the stress was on refinement of the Enterprise scheme, the sanctioning of its inclusion as a compulsory part of the province's education and in-service education of teachers. These reforms represented a general consolidation of elements or traits from the progressive education movement.

Patterson has commented:

> In Alberta, a number of factors operated jointly to produce a new approach to education. The way was prepared by forces such as economic and political unrest, increased demand on the school, changing social conditions. As these forces prepared the province for changes, a group of prominent educators began to encourage consideration and adoption of a scheme of education labelled progressive education. Like other changes, progressive education was adopted without a thorough examination by the public at large. Familiarization and examination came after the new program was implemented.[67]

The comment raises a very important point about the agricultural phase. During that period the political, family, economic and religious institutions were forced to respond to a series of crises, which resulted from demographic features: distortion in distribution of age groups, influx of non-British immigrants, increase in the already diverse religious groups; the instability of the agricultural market; the widening gulf between life chances of rural and urban dwellers; the major depressions of 1921-25 and 1929-35; the social mobility paradoxically accompanied by a large marginal element amongst the population. Although there was a deep concern for social and economic planning to counteract the dysfunctional effects of succeeding crises, at no time was this fully successful. Similarly, the changes and developments in education tended to be ad hoc solutions to urgent problems rather than part of a well-considered overall plan. It is not surprising that the post-war phase was entered upon with a backlog of unresolved problems as well as difficulties arising from a new and challenging set of circumstances.

The Urbanization and Industrialization Phase to the Early 1960s

In the wider society, the transition to peacetime seemed remarkably smooth. The servicemen and women were absorbed into the job market which had expanded under the stimulus of the war economy, and many were diverted into further education. The need for construction, which had been brought to a standstill during the war, was an especially useful opening for employment. The level of consumption of manufactured goods remained high.

In Alberta, an added advantage was gained because the grain crops were high yielding in 1946 and 1947.[68] The economy, the pace of change, and development generally, were not allowed to slacken because discoveries of the extensive Albertan oil and gas fields were made from 1947. Consequently, the idea of a scarcity economy, of the Social Credit's "pay as you go" or under-consumption policy, seemed ludicrous. The petroleum industry rapidly transformed the face of Alberta. Thinking back to previous eras in Albertan history, some trends continued and were intensified—mechanization of agriculture, further concentration of population in cities and towns and increased industrialization with its concomitant division and specialization of labour. On the other hand, certain features disappeared from the Albertan scene—many small settlements, the special ethos of country life, the small-scale independent family farm.

The effects of the war were obvious in the school system. Although school enrolments had declined in the early forties, the virtual cessation of new construction and maintenance of existing buildings meant that extensive expenditures were required to reach reasonable standards for the expected post-war increase. Perhaps the most crucial deficiency was the teacher shortage. Many veterans did not return to teaching; salaries and conditions were too favourable in other occupations. Many married women, pressed into teaching in the war years, returned to family life. The competition was strong for school leavers. Opportunities were unfolding which were not available in pre-war times. This problem was to plague educational authorities into the sixties.

The boom conditions created by the exploitation of oil and gas had their influence on education. Financially, the results are probably yet not fully calculable. Provincial reserves, the broader base for school taxes and thus increased revenues for school boards, the increase in real wages and salaries made possible material gains in education. These included new and more elaborate buildings and facilities, higher teacher salaries, assistance to students at secondary and post-secondary levels, community amenities shared with formal education—swimming pools, libraries, auditoria.

At the same time, societal values, and expectations and aspirations related to education underwent change. Education was to be the panacea for the ills of the newly-affluent society. The fifties witnessed a questioning of many of the features which had been instituted in the thirties. There was some feeling that the "good life" was being achieved too easily. The highly visible educational institution provided points of identification more readily than some other parts of society. Its associations—the schools, the teaching staffs, the prescribed curriculum were known from personal experience. This was a time of transition or adjustment to new values. The diffuse feelings of insecurity and discontent began to be crystallised and rationalized as disapproval of the educational system. The criticism against the progressive methods and curricula, lowering of standards, poorly-qualified teachers steadily mounted and was heightened by the success of the Russian space experiment in 1957. The provincial press as well as academic writers like Neatby and Hardy gave the seal of authenticity to the criticism.[69] Ferment from the education scene in the United States was easily introduced into Alberta via the media, learned journals, interchange of educational personnel and so on.

More concrete changes and developments in education in Alberta during the post-war period should not be overlooked. Administratively, the new solution to the old problem of the small school district and isolated school was the County System instituted by means of the County Act of 1950. This Act allowed for "large municipalities with the same boundaries as that of the school division and a unified single administration of the whole area."[70] The centralization trend of the agricultural phase was being maintained. With respect to financing, the province aided the school systems by legislation such as the School Borrowing Assistance Act and the School Foundation Program Plan of 1961; both aimed in part at extending the concept of equality of educational opportunity.[71] Curriculum revision was directed by committees and sub-committees appropriate to the elementary, junior high and senior high levels while wide representation allowed a variety of groups in Alberta to participate in the General Curriculum Committee.[72] These included the Alberta Trustees' Association, the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations, the Alberta Federation of Agriculture, the Alberta Women's Institute, the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, the Associated Chambers of Commerce and Agriculture, and the Alberta Federation of Labour. There was increased attention given to matriculation requirements in order to maintain satisfactory articulation with the university level of education. (The latent function seemed to be to maintain the selectivity of Alberta high schools.) More attention was being given to the place of the composite high school in the secondary system.[73]

The Annual Reports of the Department of Education throughout the fifties stressed the major problems of teacher shortage, the difficulties of maintaining an adequate standard in teacher training, and the financial strain of providing school buildings and facilities to keep pace with ever expanding school enrolments. Increasingly, concern was evidenced for what might be thought of as adaptive or auxiliary problems, technical and vocational education, the education of atypical children, and the cost of textbooks.[74]

Stevenson's comment about Canadian education in the 1950s also represents the Alberta situation:

> The fifties, for Canadian educators and governments, were years of recognizing problems and attempting to devise solutions for them. There was a great number of optimistic pronouncements concerning the state of Canadian education, but such statements were either too uncritical or official pronouncements of loyal departmental officials designed to sustain their own and the public's confidence. In fact,

> across the country and indeed, in all of North America, education was in serious trouble.[75]

It was within this socio-historical context that royal commissions of education became increasingly a common feature in Canadian society. For many Albertans, the announcement of a royal commission into education in Alberta which was made public on the 31st December, 1957[76] seemed an appropriate response to a crisis situation; for others, the announcement came "out of the blue."[77]

Emergence of the Cameron Commission

In retrospect it seems plausible that a royal commission should have been called. From the perspective of that particular year, however, why a royal commission was even needed was problematic. Goulson alludes to the problematic nature of commissions by stating that:

> A royal commission is an excuse and a reason for channelling extraordinary attention to education.[78]

It is necessary to further examine the royal commission in its socio-historical context to find some explanation of this phenomenon.

That the Cameron Commission was in existence for the period 1957-1959 is an historical fact or "given." A sociological perspective from collective behaviour theory will now be applied to the socio-historical data. This perspective attempts to explain the action of the Alberta government in establishing a royal commission in response to the ambiguous situation which had developed after successive collective definitions and redefinitions had failed to solve educational problems. The determinants of collective behaviour which were listed in chapter two are used to abstract explanatory factors from the data of the foregoing survey of Alberta and its educational system.

From the earlier portions of chapter three, eight factors leading to structural conduciveness, that is, a predisposition to some type of collective behaviour, have been identified. The first factor was the persistence of the rural motif in Alberta society even though urbanization developed early in the province's history. This meant that there was inequality of resources between the rural and urban spheres. With respect to education, the goal of equality of educational opportunity for all students, regardless of geographical location, was an unrealized ideal. Secondly, state-church relations in the province had been formalized with respect to education only after a great deal of controversy.[79] Provision was made for public and separate school systems. In practice, the harmony of this arrangement was diminished by problems with respect to administration, curriculum, staffing, buildings and other facilities. A factor closely associated with religion was the ethnic diversity of Alberta's population. To speak of ethnic groups in Alberta was necessarily to include reference to religion, language, dress, mores, values and attitudes towards education. The Ukrainian and French components of the population were largely Catholic.

A fourth factor was the diffusion of American culture, with its influence on educational patterns in Alberta. There was some resistance to the definition of Albertan needs for education in American rather than Albertan terms. A related factor was the controversy over a group rather than an individual emphasis in educational methods. This was one of the reasons for dissatisfaction with the Enterprise method which was an important feature of progressive education in Alberta.

The Eastern Canada-Western Canada split was the sixth factor. For some Albertans, Ontario conservatism in economics and politics extended into education to the detriment of Western Canada. Because of this interpretation, there was a growing resistance in Alberta to educational ideas from Ontario and an openness to educational ideas from the United States. It was felt that Ontario was still locked into a nineteenth century system of education.[80] On the other hand, there was an ambivalence as ultra-Canadian Albertans looked to Ontario for stability in these areas.

The seventh factor leading to structural conduciveness was of a different order. It was the presence in Canada of the royal commission as an institutionalized way of resolving crisis or ambiguous situations.[81] In the years following World War II, royal commissions began to be used for educational inquiries, the major one being the Hope Commission of 1950 in Ontario. This Commission was a model for educational inquiries in the other provinces.

The eighth and final factor existed at the level of abstract values in the Alberta social structure. On the one hand, there was a pragmatic materialism and on the other, a traditional idealism. The former was epitomized in the pioneers' encounters with the natural environment of the prairies and their adaptations, in the economic and political spheres, to entrenched institutions of the East. The traditional idealistic orientation incorporated notions of loyalty to the ethics of Judeo-Christianity and to the religious organizations dedicated to their preservation. This orientation included some loyalty to classical literary humanism. There was a struggle in Alberta between the concerns of the world and the concerns of the spirit.[82]

Smelser refers to the value-added nature of collective behaviour.[83] By this is meant that each determinant activated the other determinants so that the nature and quality of the interaction shaped the particular collective behaviour likely to emerge. The eight factors of structural conduciveness contained within them possibilities for a variety of collective outbursts, even within the context of a high degree of institutionalization and of government control of education in Alberta. These possibilities began to be limited as structural strains appeared and as generalized beliefs developed to explain them and to propose resolutions to problems arising from them, especially in the 1950s.

Four structural strains can be identified from the earlier historical material of this chapter. The first is logistical in nature arising from slow, or lack of, adaptation to demographic, ecological and economic changes in the province. There were increasing numbers of students, the redistribution of many families as urban areas grew and rural areas remained static or declined in population, and as northern, isolated communities remained isolated. Facilities were often inadequate or in the wrong place. Financing student transportation grew as a cost of education. Teacher personnel were in short supply, partly because other occupations were more attractive and also, for several years, because of the small pool of youth and young adults in Alberta from which they could be drawn.

A closely associated strain arose from efforts to cope with this basic strain. The larger school divisions and counties tended to remove educational administration and decision-making from many local communities and to concentrate these processes in the Department of Education or the larger school boards and their executives. There was a strain from the growing gap between the families, local organizations such as churches, and the persons who controlled education. This gap was widened with the growth of the provincial teachers' organization which tended to concentrate on teacher input into the government without increasing a flow back to local communities. The Alberta School Trustees' Association grew as a counter-force to change the arena for dealing with local educational problems, from the local community to the province. The informal local communication networks that appeared to operate well for the Social Credit party through its members of the Legislative Assembly, were not able to function to the same degree in relation to the province's growing educational bureaucracy. This source of strain may be referred to as the local-provincial hiatus.

A third strain arose in connection with educational standards and the operation of the schools as an agency of social selection for society. There was dissatisfaction over a number of aspects. The method and content of progressive education had caused concern that attention to basic literacy and numeracy had been allowed to diminish. There was uncertainty that the elementary school was achieving its tasks. With the increase in numbers and heterogeneity of abilities of students in the high schools, it was feared that preparation for matriculation was inadequate. The competition for places in the limited university system intensified this strain. Doubt had arisen as to whether certain subjects had a place in the high school curriculum. They required time which could have been spent more profitably on academic subjects. There was dissatisfaction with the "frills" which included such electives as home economics and art, and also, often-times, extracurricular activities. There was concern over early leavers who joined the expanding job market. The schools were often blamed for not holding them or not preparing them for life. Essentially, these strains appeared to be related to the social selection processes of education in a society which had little opportunity for upward mobility through education except by a limited higher education system. What was becoming apparent was the mounting strain in the goal structure of Alberta education.

Closely related to the above strain was an additional strain with regard to teacher preparation. A strong component of this strain was the presence of a capability to educate teachers to a high level of professional competence through the take-over of normal schools by the University in 1945, whereas, in reality, short periods of teacher training persisted and seemed inescapable, given the teacher shortage. Further, many teachers in rural areas were under-trained compared with those in the cities. This strain was aggravated by a demand for low-cost teachers, coming primarily from trustees and taxpayers, and the strong stands taken to support increased training by the teachers' organization and the professional educators. In structural terms, the strain here focussed on the pivotal role in the Alberta educational system, that of the teacher. The strain inhered in the persistent and apparently widening gap between actuality and potentiality in teacher preparation and anticipated role performance.

To the conditions of structural conduciveness and strain must be added a third determinant, the growth and spread of generalized beliefs, which identified, for the persons acquiring them, sources of problems and specified the appropriate responses to them. With regard to logistical problems, the generalized belief of the post-World War II years was clearly that these types of problems were the responsibility for the provincial government. There was continual pressure from the municipal level for the government to pay an increasing share of education costs, because local tax structures were limited while those of the province appeared to be flexible and expanding.

With regard to the local-provincial hiatus, the generalized beliefs did not emerge with the same degree of clarity. Even though there was evidence of widespread approval for larger units of school administration, there was a continuing concern with the increasing powerlessness of the family and local community with respect to school matters. This concern was overshadowed by the urgency of logistical problems.

The generalized beliefs related to standards and teacher education were formulated primarily by professional educators and their academic critics. The majority of Albertans tended to think in logistical terms in this regard. During the course of belief development along these lines, there was a shift in the target of criticism from the professional educators and Teachers' Association to the Department of Education and the government of the day. When the government brought in the Emergency Teacher Training Act of 1954, the Farm Women's Union of Alberta and the Alberta School Trustees' Association endorsed the government's action, but the Alberta Teachers' Association and the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations deplored this decision.[84] Both called for public inquiries to deal with the situation. In the realm of generalized belief, there was a convergence of belief about where the major responsibility rested for needed educational reform. From as early as 1953, calls for a public inquiry into Alberta education began to be heard.[85]

If there was any precipitating factor more than another that prompted reform action, it was the critical shortage of teachers. In 1953 it was reported that Alberta had been short of two hundred teachers a year for the past three years, and that vacancies were being filled with correspondence supervisors, by immigrants and by partially qualified persons granted letters of authority to teach.[86] Pressures for reform were generated by Trustees, Home and School Associations and the Teachers' Association, and by the Faculty of Education. Conferences to deal with the problem were held in a number of Alberta centres.[87]

An official pressure came from the Board of Teacher Education and Certification's appointment of a Committee under the chairmanship of Dr. A. W. Reeves, to investigate and report on the teacher shortage.[88] Another official control move was to hold a special hearing on the problems of education through the Alberta Legislature meeting as a Committee of the whole, the first week of March 1954.[89] It was called the Standing Committee of the Legislature or the Committee on Agriculture, Colonization, Immigration and Education. The thirty hour hearing was marked by behaviour approaching a hostile outburst as university students and others strongly expressed resentment and disappointment at the way the proceedings were conducted.[90]

This was followed three weeks later by introduction into the Legislature of the Alberta Emergency Teacher Training Act, calculated to provide a stream of teachers who would take a six weeks summer session in teaching methods and then go into schools with letters of authority.[91] This Act almost immediately polarized Alberta along rural-urban, farmer-professional dimensions. The professional educators perceived the Act as a threat that the government might take teacher education away from the university and into its hands.[92] The Alberta Teachers' Association was in a sense by-passed as the six-week trainees, known as student teachers, were not considered full teachers by the government and hence would not be members of the Association, as required of all certified teachers in public education.[93] At this stage, hostility was focussed on the minister of education who, according to the Alberta Teachers' Association, would have to bear the full responsibility for his six-week course.[94] The teacher shortage as a series of precipitating events interspersed with reform efforts by voluntary associations of citizens and professionals, and the series of responses from the provincial government had taken on a pattern in which there were few alternatives open to outside reformers or to government.

During the next three years, amidst continued criticism of government handling of the teacher shortage and other educational matters, there was a deliberate attempt by professional educators, led by the Faculty of Education, to minimize the possibilities for professional retrogression associated with the Emergency Teacher legislation. This served to "cool down" the issue, but at the same time did not abate the growing belief that Alberta's education in all aspects needed review.[95] The Alberta Teachers' Association proposed a public inquiry by the Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Research.[96] The Home and School Association adopted a resolution calling urgently on the government for a royal commission on education in 1956.[97] The major reform forces were in agreement on the need for a public inquiry and were defining the need in very specific terms.

The response of government as an agency of control also began to take shape at this time. The minister of education explored informally the notion of a royal commission on education.[98] By September 1957, the Cabinet had decided to move ahead with a royal commission and had outlined the terms of reference and criteria for membership. An ad hoc Advisory Committee on Education was then called to work out details.[99] On December 31 1957 the Royal Commission, its terms of reference and membership, were announced.[100] In this announcement what the government had done was to divert some of its own concerns and those of challenging reformers and groups, to the Royal Commission. The way in which collective unrest over education was to be channelled for at least two years was no longer problematic.

Summary and Conclusions

Chapter three has utilized the framework offered by the structural-functional perspective to review Alberta and its educational system over time. The purpose has been to place education in relation to other major institutions. Firstly, a more general picture was described taking into account related ideas and events in Alberta as well as influences from the total Canadian setting. Features of each of the selected institutions have been focussed on briefly, to draw out examples of their interdependence with education. Secondly, education has been placed in a central position and changes and development have been surveyed within three designated time periods. In the final section, the concepts of collective behaviour theory have been applied to the socio-historical data, which gave the context for the Cameron Commission, to provide an explanation of the emergence of this particular Royal Commission.

The Alberta Royal Commission on Education 1957-1959, conceptualized as emerging from collective behaviour associated with criticism and unrest over education, has been described. The problematic nature of the emergence of the Commission has been shown to diminish as structural-conduciveness gave rise to specific structural strains and these in turn became associated with generalized beliefs which increasingly defined Alberta's educational problems as those of the provincial government. Teacher shortage was a continuous precipitating factor. The unsuccessful ways which this has been dealt with by reform groups and responded to by government emerged as a crisis in 1954 when the government introduced emergency legislation.

The crisis, however, then became not one of shortage of teachers but of the control of teacher education. The minister of education became the focus of hostility. The call for a royal commission and the response by the government raised the whole matter to the level of normative inquiry. In retrospect, educational problems in Alberta had been collectively re-defined not only as a logistical set of problems, and not as problems residing in the role of government and the minister of education, but as problems requiring new approaches at the normative level with the creation of new regulations, laws and institutional arrangements as the official foci of concern. The Royal Commission on Education, though it might have given attention to goals and thus values associated with education, was not the expression of a value-oriented movement. It did not represent a revolution in Alberta education.

The next chapter deals specifically with the structure and function of the Royal Commission and of its termination or destructuring. In this perspective, the Royal Commission is seen as the institutionalized culmination of norm-oriented collective behaviour.

Footnotes

[1] For example, see Cohen's discussion of Social Structures and Social Systems in his book, P. Cohen, Modern Social Theory (London: Heinemann, 1968), pp. 129-167; and A. Dawe, "The Two Sociologies," British Journal of Sociology 21 (1970): 207-218.

[2] S. D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948), Preface. Clark mentions also that sociology has much to gain from a greater use of historical material and that neglect of past developments leads to a limited perspective and a narrowing of sociological theory; and Idem, The Developing Canadian Community, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), p. 290.

[3] The term "experiment" would seem to be quite appropriate even if one is thinking in terms of manipulation of variables. It has been used by B. Y. Card, The Canadian Prairie Provinces from 1870 to 1950: A Sociological Introduction (Toronto: J. M. Dent, 1960), p. 5. Various political and social implications of the Western experiment are discussed in S. D. Clark, The Developing Canadian Community, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), Chapter 13.

[4] M. Lautt, "Sociology and the Canadian Plains," in A Region of the Mind, ed. R. Allen (University of Saskatoon, Regina: Canadian Plains Studies Centre, 1973), p. 135.

[5] N. Keyfitz, "The Changing Canadian Population," in Urbanism and the Changing Canadian Society, ed. S. D. Clark (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), p. 4.

[6] B. Y. Card, Trends and Changes in Canadian Society (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1968), pp. 21-25.

[7] Two useful references in this connection are: L. Bercuson, "Education in the Bloc Settlements of Western Canada" (M.A. thesis, McGill University, 1941), p. 1; and S. D. Clark, The Developing Canadian Community, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), p. 107.

[8] W. Morton, "The 1920s," in The Canadians 1867-1967, eds. J. Careless and R. Craig-Brown (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1967), p. 229.

[9] K. McNaught, "The 1930s," in J. Careless and R. Craig-Brown, eds., op. cit., p. 238.

[10] More detail on the Depression period is given in Chapter 17 in J. G. MacGregor, A History of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta: Hurtig, 1972), pp. 261-272.

[11] K. McNaught, op. cit., p. 239.

[12] An account of the rise of Social Credit which also examines the party's policy in a particular sphere is given in R. Patterson, "The Establishment of Progressive Education in Alberta" (Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1968), pp. 73-83; an interesting "eyewitness" description is found in A. J. Hooke, 30+5 I Know, I Was There (Edmonton, Alberta: Co-op Press, 1971). Mr. Hooke gained a seat in the first Social Credit government and remained in the Legislature even after the Premier, Mr. Manning, retired at the end of 1968.

[13] K. McNaught, op. cit., p. 255.

[14] C. P. Stacey, "Through the Second World War," in J. Careless and R. Craig-Brown, eds. op. cit., p. 297.

[15] Ibid., pp. 298-299.

[16] J. G. MacGregor, op. cit., p. 293.

[17] A. Richmond, "Patterns of Post-War Immigration in Canada," in Canada: A Sociological Profile, ed. W. Mann (Canada: Copp Clark Co., 1971), p. 41.

[18] J. Katz, Society, Schools and Progress in Canada (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1969), p. 15.

[19] J. G. MacGregor, op. cit., pp. 287-301; details of these developments can be obtained also in government reports: Alberta's Economic Prospects (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1955); The Alberta Bureau of Statistics publications, Alberta Industry and Resources (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, various years).

[20] Dr. B. Y. Card has expressed another view—conceiving this period as a time of struggle for an idealistic society in Sorokin's terms, in which the dialectic was between sensate and ideational forces, with a dynamic idealism being the result. R. Patterson and B. Card, "A Socio-Historical View of Changing Social Values in Western Canada with Special Reference to Education," in School Administration and the Valuing Process, eds. Alvin Myhre et al (Edmonton, Alberta: Council on School Administration, Alberta Teachers' Association, In press).

[21] Aspects of the concerns of this paragraph are referred to in greater detail by John Porter, "Canadian Character in the Twentieth Century," in Canada: A Sociological Profile, ed. W. Mann (Canada:

Copp Clark Co., 1971), pp. 1-8; and by B. Y. Card, Trends and Changes in Canadian Society (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1968), pp. 138-142.

[22] The prairie family receives attention in two Canadian sociological works: B. Y. Card, The Canadian Prairie Provinces from 1870 to 1950: A Sociological Introduction (Toronto: J. M. Dent, 1960); and Idem, Trends and Changes in Canadian Society (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1968); a more general work in the area is exemplified by K. Ishwaran, ed., The Canadian Family (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, 1971) which consists of a collection of readings, some of which are applicable to the Western provinces.

[23] L. Larson, The Family in Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta: Human Resources Research Council, 1971), pp. 60-63.

[24] Ibid., pp. 53-56, a concise summary of detailed material from pp. 4-53.

[25] Ibid., pp. 53-54.

[26] Two useful examples are: S. Boocock, An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1972); B. Jackson and D. Marsden, Education and the Working Class (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962).

[27] Evidence for these statements is to be found in many sources, for example, briefs and research studies of the Cameron Royal Commission and the Commission's Report itself. Other examples may be found in articles in the Alberta Journal of Educational Research, for example: A. Hohol, "Factors Associated with School Drop-Outs," AJER 1 (1955): 7-17; T. Linton and D. Swift, "Social Class and Ninth Grade Educational Achievement," AJER 9 (1963): 157-167; G. Rancier, "Case Studies of High School Drop Outs," AJER 9 (1963): 13-21; H. Zentner, "Parental Behavior and Student Attitudes Toward Further Training," AJER 9 (1963): 22-30.

[28] S. D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948), p. 433.

[29] W. Mann, Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1955), pp. 153-154.

[30] Ibid., p. 153.

[31] Discussed in R. Patterson, "F. W. G. Haultain: Educational Statesman of the Canadian West," Alberta Journal of Educational Research 8 (1962): 85-93.

[32] These points are expanded in the discussion of the role of religious groups in Alberta to be found in B. Y. Card, The Canadian

Prairie Provinces from 1870 to 1950: A Sociological Introduction (Toronto: J. M. Dent, 1960), pp. 24-27.

[33] W. Mann, op. cit., p. 5.

[34] Ibid., p. 157.

[35] K. Thomson, "Religious Institutions in 'Alberta's Public Schools,'" *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 13 (1967): 65. This article cites a brief presented by the Alberta Veterinary Medical Association to Cabinet recommending such an inclusion for Grades VII to XII inclusive.

[36] Alberta, Bureau of Statistics, *Alberta's Industry and Resources* (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1959), p. 7.

[37] H. Uhlman, *Rural Alberta: Patterns of Change* (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1961), p. 24.

[38] A good account of the oil era is given by "Oil Money 1947-1971," in J. G. MacGregor, op. cit., Chapter 19.

[39] E. Hanson, *Local Government in Alberta* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1956), pp. 45-46.

[40] O. Banks, *The Sociology of Education* (London: Batsford, 1968), p. 21.

[41] This statement can be substantiated by an examination of the statistics on enrolment contained in the *Annual Reports of the Department of Education* (Edmonton, Alberta: King's/Queen's Printer, Various years). To illustrate:
Annual Report, 1936 - Total enrolment 167,193; p. 79
Annual Report, 1946 - Total enrolment 155,455; p. 107
Annual Report, 1951 - Total enrolment 173,969; p. 126
Annual Report, 1956 - Total enrolment 223,949; p. 130.

[42] E. Hanson, *Financing Education in Alberta*, Research Monograph Number 14 (Edmonton, Alberta: The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1969), p. 1.

[43] Ibid., p. 2.

[44] L. Thomas, *The Liberal Party in Alberta 1905-1921* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959), p. xi.

[45] J. Jonason, "The Large Units of School Administration in Alberta," *Canadian Education* 7 (1952): 54.

[46] N. Priestley and E. Swindlehurst, *Furrows, Faith and Fellowship* (Edmonton, Alberta: Co-op Press, 1967), p. 61.

[47] W. Morton, The Progressive Party in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950), pp. 11-18, provided a detailed discussion of both federal and provincial developments.

[48] J. Irving, The Social Credit Movement in Alberta (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959), pp. 4-7, a very detailed examination of the genesis and evolution of the Social Credit Movement up to the time when the author was writing.

[49] Ibid., p. 334.

[50] For a full exposition of this argument, see C. Macpherson, Democracy in Alberta (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1953).

[51] W. Lloyd, The Role of Government in Canadian Education (Toronto: W. J. Gage, 1959), p. 19.

[52] Ibid., pp. 27-32.

[53] H. Vaughan and M. S. Archer, Social Conflict and Educational Change in England and France 1789-1848 (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), p. 21. Vaughan and Archer have suggested that when (educational) change occurs it is brought about by the interaction of dominant and assertive groups in society. Thus, it is important to consider the linked systems of values and power.

[54] See R. Patterson, "F. W. G. Haultain: Educational Statesman of the Canadian West," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research 8 (1962): 93; and B. Walker, "The Administration of High Schools in Alberta During the Territorial Period, 1889-1905," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research 2 (1956): 210.

[55] G. Loken, "Perspectives on Change in Educational Structures in Alberta," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research 15 (1969): 210.

[56] Ibid., 211.

[57] J. Chalmers, Schools of the Foothills Province (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), p. 40.

[58] T. Sugden, "The Consolidated School Movement in Alberta 1913-1963" (M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1964), pp. 61-62.

[59] J. Chalmers, op. cit., p. 52.

[60] Discussions of the rural school experiment can be found in R. McCall, "The Rural High Schools in Alberta," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research 2 (1956): 105-113; and G. Loken, op. cit., 215-216.

[61] A detailed discussion of the period is to be found in E. Hodgson, "The Nature and Purposes of the Public School in the Northwest Territories (1885-1905) and Alberta (1905-1963)" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1964), pp. 120-170.

[62] J. Jonason, op. cit., 52.

[63] Ibid., 58-59. This article was abstracted from the thesis bearing the same title.

[64] "A Review of Education in Alberta," The Alberta School Trustee 29 (1959): 12.

[65] J. Chalmers, op. cit., pp. 89-101.

[66] "American Influence on Progressive Education in Canada," Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society (Papers and proceedings of the 1972 meeting), pp. 3-6.

[67] R. Patterson, "The Establishment of Progressive Education in Alberta" (Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1968), p. 173.

[68] J. Chalmers, op. cit.,p. 123.

[69] Commented on in interviews with Dr. H. T. Coutts (3rd June, 1974) and Dr. W. H. Swift (29th May, 1974). Neatby's most influential book was So Little for the Mind while Hardy's newspaper articles were collected and published by the Calgary Herald in one volume entitled Education in Alberta.

[70] C. Collins, "Local School District Organization in Canada," Canadian Education and Research Digest 1 (1961): 17.

[71] J. Chalmers, op. cit., p. 132.

[72] Ibid., pp. 136-137.

[73] Alberta, Department of Education, Advance in Secondary Education in Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta: King's Printer, 1951), pp. 11-12; and I. Casey, Alberta's Educational Scene (Edmonton, Alberta: Department of Education, 1952), pp. 23-24.

[74] See particularly the Deputy Minister's statement at the beginning of each Report.

[75] H. Stevenson, "Developing Public Education in Post-War Canada to 1960," in Canadian Education: A History, eds. J. Wilson, R. Stamp and L. Audet (Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall, 1970), pp. 389-390.

[76] Alberta, Department of Education, Annual Report (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1957).

[77] Comment by Mr. J. Cormack in interview, 24th May, 1974.

[78] C. Goulson, "An Historical Survey of Royal Commissions and Other Major Government Inquiries in Canadian Education" (D.Ed. thesis, University of Toronto, 1966), p. 508.

[79] M. Lupul, "Church (Catholic)-State Relations in Education in the Old North-West Territories, 1880-1905" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1963). This thesis provides a detailed discussion of the background out of which the arrangements with respect to public education were made. This system was inherited by the province of Alberta.

[80] The contrast between Western progressivism and Eastern (Ontario) conservatism in teacher education has been illustrated by C. E. Phillips, The Development of Education in Canada (Toronto: W. J. Gage, 1957), p. 584.

[81] Alberta's experience of royal commissions had not been an altogether happy one. In the Rowell-Sirois Inquiry of 1939, the Social Credit government of Alberta chose to boycott it and to publish instead, a volume called "A Case for Alberta." This action might be interpreted also, as a further example of Western Canadian-Eastern Canadian antipathy.

[82] A discussion of values in Western Canada may be found in B. Y. Card, The Canadian Prairie Provinces from 1870 to 1950: A Sociological Introduction (Toronto: J. M. Dent, 1960).

[83] N. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 18.

> "According to the logic of the value-added approach, any event or situation, in order to become a determinant of a collective episode, must operate within the limits established by other determinants."

This is contrasted with the natural history approach which claims that "certain uniformities of sequence [exist] in the unfolding of an episode of collective behavior."

The stages in the natural history model of collective behaviour are social unrest, collective excitement, formal organization, termination with institutionalization. It can be seen that this model is less useful in the case of the emergence of the Cameron Royal Commission.

[84] Noted in a speech to the Legislature by H. J. MacDonald and reported in the Edmonton Journal, 30 March 1954, p. 19.

[85] A call for an inquiry into education was made, for example, by H. J. MacDonald in the Legislature, speech reported in the Edmonton Journal, 28 February 1954, p. 17.

[86] Data from a committee appointed by the Board of Teacher Education and Certification to inquire into the teacher shortage, reported in The ATA Magazine 33 (1953): 26.

[87] This information was obtained in a telephone interview with Dr. H. Coutts, Dean of the Faculty of Education at the time of the Commission, 26 October 1974, and confirmed by an item entitled "Northern Conference to Probe Teacher Shortage Problems," the Edmonton Journal, 17 April 1956, p. 17.

[88] The Committee to investigate and report with respect to the teacher shortage in Alberta was mentioned in the President's Report, in The ATA Magazine 33 (1953): 26.

[89] Report of the motion in the Legislature to hold a special sitting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Colonization, Immigration and Education, 8 March 1954, was found in the Hansard Scrapbook, 26 February 1954, p. 21, in the Legislative Library, Edmonton.

[90] This information was obtained from the Secretary's Report in The ATA Magazine 34 (1954): 48.

[91] From a news item in the Edmonton Journal, 30 March 1954, p. 19.

[92] Comment by Dr. H. Coutts in telephone interview, 26 October 1974.

[93] Secretary's Report, The ATA Magazine 34 (1954): 48.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Comment by Dr. H. Coutts in telephone interview, 26 October 1974.

[96] Reported in a news item in the Edmonton Journal, 31 October 1956, p. 17.

[97] Alberta Home and School News 1 (1956): 5.

[98] This incident was drawn to the attention of the researcher during the interview with Dr. T. C. Byrne on 14 June 1974. Dr. Byrne recounted that late in 1956 or early 1957, he travelled by car with the minister of education and chief superintendent from Red Deer to Edmonton. During the trip, Mr. Aalborg expounded his views favouring a royal commission on education in Alberta.

[99] Order-in-Council 1403/57, Edmonton, 9 September, 1957.

[100] Order-in-Council 2009/57, Edmonton, 31 December, 1957.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE CAMERON COMMISSION: A STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL VIEW

Introduction

This chapter will continue the sociological examination of the Commission utilizing structural-functional theory. It was assumed that after December 31, 1957, the Royal Commission was an institutionalized social system which underwent an operations phase and then the processes of termination or destructuring.[1] Structural-functional theory contains three major concepts—system, structure and function. A pre-requisite for the application of the perspective is that the social reality to be investigated exhibit the characteristics of a social system. In Rocher's terms, the properties of a system include "elements which share mutually interdependent relationships" and "the whole entity cannot be reduced . . . to the sum of these elements."[2] It is therefore the intent of the chapter that the structure of this body be examined so that its internal and external structural-relationships might be described. Further, the functions of the Commission will be considered so that the functional relationships which linked it to other systems might be similarly described.

The groundwork for the proposed analysis was prepared in the previous chapter by placing the Commission in its broad socio-historical context and by tracing its emergence. The focus has shifted in the following examination to its more immediate socio-cultural context. The application of the structural-functional perspective is designed to elicit answers to the "how" or "what" questions about the Commission. These included: how was the Commission established, how did it go about its task, how did it report its findings, and how was it terminated or destructured, (including what was the response to its recommendations)?

Structure of the Commission

Structure consists of values, norms and goals, status positions and roles, and facilities.[3] The norms and the goals of the Commission were reflected in its terms of reference. The personnel occupied various status positions and assumed the roles associated with them. Each of these individuals brought with him his own system of values. Facilities might be considered as personnel, budget and time. Attention to the structure of the Commission will help to establish some of the structural relationships which were formed within the Commission and with individuals and groups external to it.

The Commission was established by means of the Order-in-Council of December 31, 1957, which contained both the terms of reference and the list of Commissioners, also designating the Chairman. The Commission was created by the government of the day and thus its influence and that of its Department of Education on the structuring of the Commission was evident.

Terms of Reference

Having designated the area of investigation of Alberta education as the elementary and secondary sub-systems, the Cabinet with the advice of the deputy minister and his senior officers, and with the affirmation of the Advisory Committee, framed the terms of reference. These formed the major part of the Order-in-Council, being expressed in some detail. The Commission's overall mandate stated:

> A. The Commissioners shall study and consider the aims and objectives essential to maintain a proper and adequate educational program for pupils of the elementary and secondary schools of the Province.[4]

In order to specify "proper" matters for the commissioners' "special regard," a list of subjects was included which pertained to the following:

> (1) The curricular programs of the several school levels.
> (2) The attainment of school pupils and the procedures governing their classification and promotion.
> (3) The extent to which various special services, and the nature of those services, should be adopted as integral parts of the educational system of the Province.
> (4) Types of school organization.
> (5) Physical facilities.
> (6) The quality and supply of teachers.
> (7) The relationship of the educational system to the requirements of industry and the modern community.
> (8) The economics of education in so far as finance is a factor in respect to an appraisal of the matters enumerated above and other related subjects.[5]

The emphasis on organizational features of the education system, that is, with the facilities level, in these subjects was strong. The extent, distribution and allocation of personnel, materials and facilities rather than how these functioned in the control/administration/teaching/examinations systems of the schools were the key variables. The specific subjects of study were not directly related to the overall concern for aims and objectives.

Membership

The government acting on the suggestions of the deputy minister and his Department, the Advisory Committee and in line with its own wishes, decided on the size of the Commission and the actual Commissioners. In addition, the chairman was appointed prior to the Commission undertaking its work. Therefore, this information was officially released with the announcement of the inquiry and its terms of reference.[6]

The six-member Commission comprised representatives of professional educators—the Director of the School of Fine Arts, Banff and a member of the Canadian Senate, and a professor of educational administration at the University of Alberta. The women were both prominent figures in public affairs in Alberta especially the Farmers' organizations and the Home and School Association respectively. Within the Commission they represented the viewpoint of the rural and urban sectors generally, as well as their major reference groups. A retired provincial manager of the Hudson's Bay and T. Eaton's companies expressed the wishes of the business community. The Separate Schools, specifically the Roman Catholic system, were represented by an Edmonton lawyer, the only Catholic on the Commission and a devout member of his Church. Commissioners are said to be appointed because of their impartiality, representativeness, acknowledged expertise or status as a "public figure" (or of course, all, or a combination of these attributes). The first attribute would seem to be inapplicable in this case as the minister and his deputy minister indicated that the "partiality," or strong interest, of the various people with respect to education contributed to their selection.[7] It can be seen that if the commissioners are classified by sex, religion, ethnic background, occupation and other reference groups, even this small group reflected important lines of division within the larger social system and this might be expected to have some influence on the structural relationships formed within the Commission and external to it.

Each commissioner brought with him, three elements: his unique biography, stock of knowledge at hand and particular interests.[8] All of these features might be expected to influence the actor's perception of his situation and his behaviour within it. At this stage, comment will be restricted to education (and consequently, occupation) as one aspect of the three elements. Most of the commissioners had gained some, if not all, of their formal education in the Albertan system. Most of them had children who had been or were being educated in Alberta. Two members were teaching in or closely associated with the university level of education. Dr. Mowat had been a teacher, superintendent, high school inspector and assistant director of school administration with the Alberta Department of Education. Mrs. Taylor had trained in the Camrose Normal School and taught briefly in the Albertan school system. These were the only commissioners with teaching experience at the school level. Mrs. Hansen had been on the executive of both federal and provincial branches of the Home and School Movement, a member of curriculum and other committees of the Department of Education, had served on the Calgary School Board and the Senate of the University of Alberta.

Mr. Cormack had held executive office in the Law Society of Alberta and had been closely associated with the Catholic Education Association and Committee. He was thoroughly conversant with the legal aspects of the Separate/Public schools arrangement in Alberta. Mr. Douglas had been a prominent member of the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, an organised voluntary group with an interest in some aspects of formal education.[9]

Thus the education level of the commissioner himself, and his adult interest in education leading to either a career in education or to participation in official educational structures as a layman, represented a set of indicators. They placed these six individuals within certain networks which helped to explain the reason for their selection and their position and role on the Commission. For example, from the beginning, the lay personnel accepted a secondary position in matters of organization and formal research in relation to the professional educators Dr. Mowat and Dr. Rees.

Budget

The Minister of Education and the Chairman of the Royal Commission met prior to the Commission's operation to establish a maximum budget of $200,000; a substantial figure.[10] The understanding was that if necessary, further application might be made for funds, but the government anticipated that the costs of the Commission would be held within the limits set.[11]

It was reported in the Legislature on April 6, 1960 by the Provincial Treasurer (on request of one of the members) that the total cost of the Commission had been $123,663. The greater part of the expenditure was for commissioners' salaries; the total being $72,282. The other expenses of the Commission were taken up by the cost of printing the majority and minority reports—$15,414 and $268 respectively; research—$16,242 and travelling expenses—$19,725.[12]

One can see the priorities set in the operation of this Commission. Approximately sixty percent of the total budget was expended on commissioners' salaries, compared with about thirteen percent for research. Considering the Commission as an information-gathering device, a heavy emphasis was placed on the collection and selection of "public or folk" knowledge, by the predominantly lay Commission. "Research or expert" knowledge[13] was obtained at a lesser cost. The greatest expense both in time and money was devoted to carrying out the task of gauging public opinion on education.

Duration

The Order-in-Council giving statutory recognition to the investigation into public education by means of a Royal Commission was dated December 31st, 1957. Nowhere in this document was there any indication of a time limit for the inquiry. This was in accordance with usual practice. The commissioners were to judge the extent of time required to accomplish the task and inform the government when their report was to be anticipated. With the handing of the Report to the Lieutenant Governor on November 9th, 1959, the Cameron Commission officially went out of existence.

In the case being considered, the Commission occupied almost two years. Only in the closing months was there pressure by the Minister on the Commission to bring its work to a rapid conclusion.[14] Later evidence will show that many of the recommendations made by the Commission were actually being implemented prior to or at the time of the Report. This would seem to have lessened the urgency of the need for a commission. The question of the apparent dilatory attitude of the government might have been interpreted by Goulson in the following way—that the commission was used to pave the way for legislative action already planned and thus the public mind was to be set into "positive and sympathetic motion."[15] A different interpretation would have been advanced by Doern and Aucoin—that the commission was being used to "prove" the government's concern for improved policy-making.[16] It is not necessary, in this case, to see these explanations as mutually exclusive interpretations.

The Commission's structure evolved from factors such as the terms of reference, membership, finance and time. Each of these factors was linked to the others and also contributed to the whole—the social system of the Commission. The terms of reference, for example, influenced the composition of the Commission and the time and financial resources allocated, and reflected norms and goals imposed on the Commission, and value orientations with respect to education. The positions of the commissioners in their networks external to the Commission helped to explain their selection and why the Commission was considered to be "representative." The budget, regarding both finance and time, structured the Commission in matters such as the number of research personnel employed, the amount and nature of the research undertaken, and the origin of the resource people used. The Commission's status and task enabled it to play, for a limited time, a strategic role in potential policy-making for education. However, its influence was diminished by the structure of the power relationships operating between the government and the Department of Education.

Function of the Commission

The major emphasis of this section is to provide a description of the function of the Commission and the functional links it established due to its strategies of operation.[17] In other words, how did it come to terms with the dissent over education? It must be noted that the treating of structure and function in separate sections has not precluded aspects of these two elements emerging in both discussions. The two phases in the Commission's strategies of operation were those of information-gathering and evaluating, consolidating and reporting.

Information-Gathering Phase

The focus in this phase was on the mechanism for obtaining information, and on the nature of the information gathered.

Mechanism of information-gathering

Calling for briefs

It was an accepted part of the task of a royal commission to call for briefs. Adequate publicity had to be achieved to bring this to the notice of all who might wish to contribute. An advertisement subsequently appeared in all Alberta papers, which solicited briefs and indicated where public hearings would be held.[18] The Commission and its work received further publicity as organized groups brought the matter to the attention of their members. As an example, the Alberta Teachers' Association journal carried the announcement which was substantially the same as in the provincial papers and included also, the terms of reference.[19]

The public advertisement marked the point at which the Commission openly undertook its functions based on the statutory authority of the Order-in-Council. A letter was sent to each individual or organization on reception of their brief or submission.[20] This specified the nature of the hearing and the part the contributors and public were expected to play.

Scheduling of hearings

Scheduling of hearings was a related concern. Cross-examination in open session of those who had presented briefs was conducted. One commissioner was given the role of the Main Inquisitor at each session. The briefs and public hearings contributed very largely to the stock of knowledge the Commission gained in order to fulfil its task of tapping public opinion.

The selection of sites for the hearings was determined by the factors of population and accessibility and guided by the desire to facilitate public participation. The commissioners used a map of the province to try to ensure that few people would have to travel more than fifty miles to attend an open hearing of the Commission.[21] This represented one of the details making up the strong emphasis placed by the Commission on providing a forum for public opinion on education.[22] To illustrate the distribution of hearings and of briefs a summary table has been included in Appendix DI.4. The table indicates that seventeen centres were used. More than sixty percent of the briefs listed were heard in Calgary or Edmonton.

Calling of witnesses

Calling of witnesses to closed hearings was an additional mechanism. These witnesses were generally "experts" on a particular matter and the nature of the hearing assured confidentiality. Information might reach the Commission in this way which was not readily available otherwise.[23]

Individual submissions

Individual submissions were received by the Commission. Their acceptance did not necessarily entail cross-examination in hearings. The correspondence was filed and a letter of acknowledgement was sent from the secretary.[24]

The foregoing aspects of the function of the Commission indicated the construction of a network of functional relationships to achieve Commission purposes.

Duties of Commission personnel

Duties of the personnel gave further insight into the strategies of operation. The major components of the Commission's structure were the Secretary, the Research Director and the

Commissioners. The distinction between formal and informal research will be made in this section.

The duties and some of the tasks of the secretary and research director were outlined at the early sessions of the Commission's regular meetings. The secretary's duties included responsibility for supplies, office space, equipment, office staff, assistant to the secretary. He had to obtain reference material, check research activities, tape record hearings, obtain transcripts of evidence, and make travel and accommodation arrangements. In addition, the educational expertise of the secretary was recognized (Dr. Rees had been a member of the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta and a High School Inspector). As a consequence, he was asked to participate in discussions, to bring forward proposals, to analyse evidence and to assist in writing the Report. These were the tasks of a Commissioner.[25]

Though the Commission was not clear initially on the extent of formal research to be undertaken, a time limit for submission of research findings was laid down as October, 1958. The Research Director had jurisdiction over all formal research projects, although it was understood that he would call on consultants and other assistance as required. He was personally involved in only some of the research for which he had a special interest; the teacher study, the study on matriculation standards, and evaluation and Departmental examinations. Dr. R. MacArthur, a faculty member in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Alberta was the research director, and had considerable experience with empirical research.

For each project, the research director had to outline the proposal, calculate the budget, engage personnel, draw up contracts and send in monthly reports to the Commission on the status of the projects. There was a definite lack of research personnel as there were few doctoral programmes at the University from which to obtain graduate students as research assistants. Research was therefore carried out largely by university faculty members.[26] Thus another functional link was forged with the university.

Informal research of many kinds was undertaken by the commissioners themselves. Such research included reading of reference material, visits to schools, attendance at conferences. One such conference was the First Canadian Conference on Education in Ottawa, February 17-20, 1958 at which the Commission was represented.[27]

Two of the lay commissioners, Mrs. Taylor and Mrs. Hansen indicated that reference material was brought to their attention by Dr. Mowat, especially (Dr. Mowat was the vice-chairman of the Commission and a professional educator).[28] Visits to special educational establishments such as the Bowden Institution and the School for the Deaf, as well as to other schools in Wainwright, Calgary and Edmonton, were recorded in Commission minutes.[29]

The duties of the commissioners themselves received attention from the beginning. They included attendance at meetings of all types, individual research and reporting back to the Commission's regular meetings. Briefs were to be read and questions prepared for cross-examination at hearings. Different commissioners acted as main inquisitor for various hearings. Transcripts of hearings and other submissions had to be read. Discussion and analysis of evidence with the subsequent development of recommendations, critical review of such proposals in regular sessions of the Commission, contribution to the writing of the report itself were central tasks. Finally, the members of the Commission had to be accessible to public and press on Commission matters.[30]

Nature of Commission information

> By its very nature the work of a Royal Commission on Education must involve wide-ranging contacts and consultations with individuals, authorities and organizations, not only in the province concerned but throughout the world.[31]

Briefs and hearings

The briefs and hearings elicited major contributions to the Commission's information input. The Commission received one hundred and eighty-nine briefs and eighty-five other submissions. Six hundred people were heard in the public hearings scheduled in seventeen centres at intervals within the time period April to November, 1958. In addition, less formal contact was made by others interested in the Commission's work—using letters, telephone calls and personal visits.[32] A knowledge of the range of briefs presented to the Commission is of value in revealing sources of the Commission's information input and possible links in networks formed by the groups or individuals presenting them. A complete list of briefs has been included in Appendix DII.7.[33]

Of the briefs, thirty were presented by individuals and the remaining one hundred and fifty-nine, by various groups. One was contributed by a group with international affiliation—the Council for the Study of Exceptional Children, while those representing federal connections included the Humanities Association of Canada, the Canadian Federation of University Women, the Canadian Association of Health, the Canadian Bandmasters' Association and the Canadian Mental Health Association. Two briefs added an interprovincial flavour—that of Dr. G. Millar of the University of Saskatchewan and the brief of the Lutheran Educators of Alberta and British Columbia. The remainder were from Alberta itself.

As one might have expected, the greater proportion of briefs, approximately fifty percent, came from individuals and groups involved in education directly or having a strong interest through previous education or as members of an organized voluntary group associated with the institution of education. The briefs from education-affiliated groups have been categorised and included below.[34] Of the individual briefs, twenty were from teachers. The Home and School Associations provided the greatest number of briefs, followed by the public school administrators and teacher associations. The strength of the structural and functional relationship developed between the Commission and these groups had been reflected in a quantitative way.

A point of interest was that only five briefs were received from ethnic groups; the Edmonton Jewish Council, the Indian Association, the French Canadian Association and two from Ukrainian groups. This may have been a reflection of the development of greater cohesiveness in Alberta society with subsequent functional integration between

TABLE 1

*SELECTED GROUP BRIEFS TO COMMISSION

Group Category	Brief Number
Student Groups	84, 133
Teacher Associations	31, 36, 80, 97, 107, 125 132, 139, 151, 160, 184
Public School Administrators	82, 89, 106, 112, 116, 122, 129, 131, 147, 153, 156, 166, 167
Catholic School Administrators	2, 35, 134
University Faculties	61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 100
University Women	22, 23, 101, 126
Home and School Associations	32, 40, 41, 43, 52, 55, 69, 81, 88, 96, 102, 104, 110, 113, 118, 135, 138, 140, 141, 144, 148, 152, 168, 171, 114, 179
Catholic Alumnae	26, 53
Special Interests	14, 47, 99, 109, 130, 144, 180
Communication	15, 16

SOURCE: Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

*Briefs from groups closely affiliated with education.

home and school. With respect to religious groups, seven briefs came from Protestant groups with five from Roman Catholic groups. In spite of the provision for separate schools in Alberta, this small number was somewhat surprising. Other categories represented included: family organizations—the Alberta Council for Child and Family Welfare; business groups—the Canadian Petroleum Association; agricultural groups—the Alberta Sugar Beet Growers; welfare and health groups—Junior Hospital League; service—Kiwanis Club, West Edmonton; labour organizations—Alberta Federation of Labour; political parties—Co-operative Commonwealth Federation; cultural—Alberta Society of Artists; and leisure—Alberta Fish and Game Association.

The content of the group briefs might be categorised as largely informative of the group presenting the brief, or mainly critical of the education system. The major theme was closely related to the particular interests of the group; for example, business groups were mostly concerned with characteristics of employees, agricultural groups with the provincial schools of agriculture and the teaching of agriculture in the high schools. The briefs informed the Commission on various functions of the groups in Alberta society, for example, French language groups for the retention of the French culture. Aspects of the educational system were criticized and alternatives suggested by most of the briefs. Issues receiving the greatest attention were standards in curriculum, teacher supply and quality, pupil evaluation and achievement, that is, certain areas of strain-logistical problems, and problems of standards and teacher qualifications.[35] Linkages between various societal groups and education were demonstrated.

Other submissions, interviews, contribution of consultants

These facets of the operation of the Commission constituted a second type of information input. The Report states that there were eighty-five submissions other than briefs, although no exact definition of "other submissions" was given. Reference was made in a previous section to the file of correspondence on individual submissions but this totalled only fourteen letters.[36]

A large number of consultants provided the Commission with specialized knowledge on particular topics. Mention was made in the Report of officials from government departments, university faculty, teachers and administrators, employers, industrial leaders and technical experts.[37] Commission minutes helped to provide examples of the contribution of consultants.[38]

Materials which might have assisted the commissioners to prepare themselves for the briefs and hearings were to be found in the Commission library. For example, the Department of Education provided curriculum guides, the School Act, lists of pamphlets and periodicals in the Edmonton Library thought to be of value, materials on historical aspects of education in Alberta, Annual Reports of the Department, books, Reports of Royal Commissions in other provinces and material on education in other countries.[39]

Other Commissions

Other Commissions provided a source of information. A news item in one of the provincial papers reported proposed discussions under the title, "Educational Findings to be Pooled." This furnished some evidence of the network which had developed amongst the members of the concurrent commissions representing provincial authorities.[40] Two subsequent meetings of interprovincial commissioners were held March and July, 1959.[41] The item also referred to research to be carried out by the Commission's secretary on mathematics teaching by closed-circuit television in the United States.

Formal research

Formal research was undertaken and Appendix C of the Report contains abstracts of major research projects sponsored by the Commission.[42] In this regard, the source of information can be interpreted in three ways: firstly, in terms of the personnel conducting the research, secondly, from the individuals and groups researched and the documentary materials consulted to gain the data for the studies, and thirdly, the topics of the research studies.

With regard to the researchers, all personnel were drawn from the university, either faculty or graduate students. For example, Dr. Hanson who was responsible for population and economic research, was a professor of economics at the University of Alberta while Mr. Lindstedt, Dr. Black and Dr. Andrews were staff members of the Faculty of Education. The researched included pupils in Alberta schools, teachers, school administrators, superintendents, university staff, businessmen and "the public." Department of Education records, government statistics, University Registrars' records, the results of testing programmes conducted at school level in Alberta, were examples of documentary material used for data.

Topics for research included public and professional opinion on the tasks of the school, academic performance of students at grade nine level, the characteristics of the Alberta teaching force, school examination practices. Survey and case-study descriptive research designs were used, with particular emphasis on survey techniques. The commissioners, with the exception of Dr. Mowat, were not involved in the formal research.

Examination of the information-gathering phase indicated that mechanisms typical of commissions of inquiry were used to obtain detailed information on the subject of the inquiry.

Evaluation, Consolidation and Reporting Phase

This section is concerned with method of reporting, the knowledge produced by the Commission and evaluation and consolidation required for this task.

Method of reporting

Written report

A report to be presented to the Lieutenant Governor, was expected at the completion of the inquiry. The Order-in-Council[43] made reference to the matter of a report and the Minister of Education and the Premier of the day have indicated that the government expected the Commission to produce recommendations for its guidance in future policy-making.[44] The Commission presented its reports on November 9 1959, after an investigation lasting almost two years. The majority report was signed by five members while Mr. Cormack submitted a minority report. The reports were accompanied by additional information including briefs and their summaries, transcripts of hearings, research reports and their summaries. Thus the range of "folk" and "expert" knowledge elicited by the Commission was made available to the government.

A number of references to the final report were made in the Commission minutes. The decisions which had to be made concerned: the presentation of interim reports, format, authorship, degree of specificity or generality of content, the possibility of a minority report and publication.[45] The commissioners decided against preliminary reports because of the interrelated nature of their recommendations. Particular recommendations had to be seen in relation to the background material and discussion provided.

The Commission had to decide on the method of compiling the report—that is, whether to entrust it to one commissioner, to share the task among themselves or to employ one or more consultants. The outcome was a combination of these alternatives. The assistant to the Secretary, after providing a consolidation of the five thousand recommendations drawn from all sources, drafted the initial report. The commissioners critically assessed the draft, suggesting modifications. Certain commissioners were responsible for writing succeeding drafts of particular sections, which in turn were assessed by the Commission as a whole.[46] The final review and polishing of the report was carried out by Dr. Baker, a member of the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta, who was retained as a consultant for the task. The minority report was the responsibility of the dissident commissioner.

At the 37th Regular Meeting of the Commission in late September, 1959, Mr. Cormack proposed that the whole issue of the philosophy of education in Alberta be reviewed so that the Commission's report might set out one definite philosophy.[47] This was contrary to the wishes of the remainder of the Commission and would have entailed prolonging the Commission beyond a desirable limit in the government's view. This request in fact meant that the Commission should turn its attention to the values level of the social structure (the education system of Alberta), as well as the facilities, positions and norms and goals levels. The request was not acceded to and Mr. Cormack took no further part in the preparation of the main report. The minority report was presented on November 1, 1959 and was discussed by the Commission. As no agreement was reached, the two reports were presented on November 9. It is important to see this as the end-point of a process which began with the selection of a Catholic commissioner with a particular biography, knowledge at hand and interests. This initial step resulted in a particular structure in the Commission. Because of the division into majority and minority status positions and roles among the commissioners, however, the institutionalized aspects of its operation were little affected. It was not until the termination and later destructuring phases that the minority perspective was able to become prominent.

The printing of the Report was not well organized. Only eight typewritten copies were available for use of members of the Legislature and the press at that date. It was not until large numbers were released by the government printer that the public was able to have ready access to the document produced by the Commission.

Informal reporting

This form of reporting acquired enhanced significance in view of the delay in making the written report available. This was accomplished in two ways—via the media, particularly the press, and the appearance of commissioners at meetings of organized groups at which they were able to interpret the recommendations of the Commission to a "live" audience.[48] The reporting in the press took two forms—the commissioners gave official press conferences[49] and the secretary released communiqués indicating the progress of the Commission's work;[50] and, in addition, there were frequent news items throughout the life of the Commission reporting the hearings and other meetings, and providing reactions to the work of the Commission.[51] This meant that there were "interim reports" of a sort to keep the public informed. It is assumed that the other media, radio and television conducted a similar coverage which clearly illustrates the functioning of these particular networks in disseminating ideas. In this way a further example has been provided of interdependence among the subsystems in a society.

Thus the method of reporting may be seen to have involved the Commission directly as well as others external to it. It took different forms, both written and oral, formal and informal and occurred at different stages in the Commission's life-history. The structural and functional links between the Commission and the components (groups and individuals) of its socio-cultural context were reaffirmed by the reporting process.

Knowledge produced

The argument advanced earlier in the chapter was that the Commission functioned to achieve at least three manifest purposes: to survey the entire school system of the province, to provide a forum for public opinion on education and to complete as accurately and objectively as possible, the phases of information-gathering and evolution of recommendations about the system. Attached to each of these purposes was the process of knowledge production. According to Willer, knowledge refers to the set of ideas about the nature of the world and the relationships in it held by various individuals or groups at any time.[52] The term "produced or production" can be used in two senses here. Firstly, the Commission facilitated the expression of a variety of sets of ideas about the nature of education and its relationships with particular reference to Alberta. Secondly, the members, utilizing the different sets of knowledge made available to them, developed their own explanations of education in Alberta. Thus the recommendations contained in the report might be labelled "Commission knowledge."

The Commission's strategies of operation were designed to elicit as great a range of response in the province as possible. The yield of knowledge was derived from group and individual briefs and their subsequent hearings, other submissions and formal research. In these cases, the information was gained in a public setting or was made public by the media. Other information was not released. Evidence supplied by certain witnesses and consultants was treated as confidential,[53] as were details of some formal research.[54] Much of the informal research—that of the commissioners' own reading for example, was not recorded either in the minutes of meetings or expressed directly in the report but it undoubtedly added to each member's store of knowledge.

Both public and non-public, "folk" and "expert" or research knowledge gathered from these sources contributed to the commissioners' perceptions of the structure and function of the Alberta education system. The Commission appeared to stress the analysis of the system's structure rather than its implicit or stated aims and purposes, and to place greater reliance on the information derived from the groups representing professional educators.[55]

Evaluation and consolidation

It was in the evaluation and consolidation stage that latent conflict [56] within the Commission was manifested as a fundamental dissensus which resulted in the production and submission of two reports. Awareness of the possibility of a minority report appeared earlier in the Commission's information-gathering phase[57] but had remained in abeyance with the partial withdrawal of the dissident member from the proceedings and with the dominance of the influence of the majority perspective. With the gradual crystallization of the structure of the report via the steps previously noted, the avoidance of confrontation was no longer possible. At the 37th Regular

Meeting of the Commission on 30 September-1 October, 1959, the impasse was resolved. Proposals put forward by Mr. Cormack were not assented to by the other commissioners. The organization of the majority report, to be completed by October 14, was assigned to Dr. Mowat, Dr. Rees and Dr. Baker. If the distinctive perceptions of the information input and the particular stock of knowledge at hand possessed by the dissenting member were to be recognized and made public a second report was necessary. Thus a minority report bearing Mr. Cormack's signature was the result.

The majority report

This report was derived from the transformation of information which produced five thousand recommendations for change in the educational system. Having structured the information input to this extent, the commissioners' final task was to condense and refine these ideas still further to produce a "manageable" set of recommendations to present to the government. This stage led to the two hundred and eighty recommendations which appeared in the majority report. The accompanying table indicates the relationship between areas of interest and recommendations. The emphasis on curriculum, the teaching profession and aspects relating to authority in the system (the general issue of emphasis of centralization or local autonomy)—roles of superintendents and principals, accreditation, can be noted.

The minority report

This report was organized in sections which paralleled those of the other report. The sections referred to areas of public concern,

TABLE 2

INDEX TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION

Area of Interest	Recommendation Number	Subject of Recommendations
Accreditation	1 - 4	Accreditation of schools
Examinations	5 - 14	Departmental examinations
Curriculum	15 - 26	Curriculum authority
	27 - 37	Curriculum structure
	38 - 119	Curriculum fields
Further Education	120 - 130	Community colleges, adult education
Teachers	131 - 174	Qualifications, salaries and conditions
Special Personnel	175 - 196	Superintendents, special services, principals, guidance
Supporting Services	197 - 220	Textbooks, health services, student aid, handicapped and gifted children
Facilities and School Organization	221 - 259	Facilities and equipment, school buses, residences, libraries, audio-visual, TV, school day, school year
Minority Education	260 - 273	Hutterities, Indians, Separate schools
Research	274 - 279	Educational research
Planning	280	Planning Commission

SOURCE: Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1959), Appendix A.

population and occupation trends, aims of education, provincial-local relationships, accreditation, examinations, school organization, the subject fields, special curriculum issues, elective programs, the community college, teachers, special personnel, facilities and equipment, separate schools and the educational planning commission—from this member's perspective. The subject of underlying philosophies in Alberta education was treated as a dichotomy between "progressivism" and "essentialism."[58]

The minority commissioner adopted the position that the education system in Alberta had been dominated by the influence of progressivism. This was considered to be dysfunctional in its effects on the system and on the students and their families served by the system.[59] In order to restore education to its former condition, a return to essentialism was necessary. The tenor of the minority report was, therefore, a rebuttal of most of the findings and recommendations of the majority report with the substitution of one dominant recommendation, the replacing of progressivism with essentialism in theory and in practice. The emphasis on the need to seriously consider the aims and objectives of the education system was in strong contrast to the almost incidental treatment of the same issue in the majority report. This indicated the different perceptions of the majority and minority commissioners on the levels in the system at which educational problems were to be found.

The analysis of the function of the Commission has shown that the Cameron Commission exhibited features typical of Canadian royal commissions. It has demonstrated the emphasis placed on the task of collecting public opinion on the problem being investigated, and yet the reliance on "experts" to provide specialized knowledge. This was a feature of the Commission's management of public dissent over education. The concurrence of the recommendations of the majority report with the views of the major professional groups was linked with the dominance of the professional educator in the structure and function of the Commission as well as the nature of the networks (or structural and functional relationships) formed between the Commission and those groups. The submission of dual reports was seen as a reflection of the structuring of the Commission, the personal attributes of the minority commissioner, and the underlying structural strain of the public/separate division in the context of the Alberta education system.

Destructuring the Commission

Although the Commission officially ended on November 9, 1959 with the submission of its Report, the destructuring of the Commission was actually a complex process. The commissioners were no longer official members when the time came for the Commission to be deinstitutionalized and destructured, and for other structures to carry on many of the functions of the Commission. In a sense, the official ending of the Commission was a signal that the official agencies of control were expected to take over. It was also the signal to interested reformers and reform groups that the field for collective behaviour was again open for "free play."

The actions of the commissioners after the submission of the

Report prolonged their association with the Commission, although the social system itself had been dissolved. Mention has already been made of the voluntary participation of former commissioners in public meetings for the purpose of clarifying issues for groups such as Home and School Associations and of re-stating either the majority or minority positions. The public identification of these individuals with the (officially terminated) Commission had the effect of retarding the deinstitutionalization process. The public reaction to the Commission Report, including the role of the press, and the official decisions with regard to incorporating the recommendations of the Commission into policy, were two other facets in the process of the deinstitutionalization and destructuring of the Commission. These represented the next stage in the collective behaviour of the reform groups and official agencies, whose collective behaviour has been examined in the emergent and operations stages related to the Royal Commission.

Public Reaction

Each of the main provincial papers gave extensive coverage to the Report of the Cameron Commission listing the major recommendations, providing quite an amount of detail on certain areas of particular interest, for example, teacher training and qualifications, and including lengthy quotes from the minority report. It is interesting to note the emphases in the various newspapers of November 16, 1959. The headline of the Edmonton Journal referred to the merit pay issue. This had been a point of controversy between the Alberta Teachers' Association and the Blackstock Commission conducted just prior to the Cameron Commission. The Calgary Herald's front page drew attention to the division in the Commission with the item "Minority Report Filed: Basic Ideology Queried." The Albertan's headline, "Cameron Report Endorses Present System" could be interpreted in at least three ways: as a plain statement of fact, as a subtle criticism that the Commission had failed to recognize the deficiencies of education in Alberta or as an indication of the system's basic soundness.[60]

Once the recommendations had been outlined for the public, the press concentrated on criticism in the form of editorials, news items contrasting the two reports[61] and coverage of meetings at which commissioners spoke.[62] To illustrate, the Edmonton Journal ran a series of editorials throughout November of 1959.[63] The first, 17 November, entitled "Quality and Essentials in School," suggested that the need for higher standards in education in the province directs attention to the "traditionalist" school of thought discussed in the minority report and concluded:

> [Mr. Cormack] is to be congratulated on his good judgment and very valuable contribution to the work of the Commission, and for his courage in grasping and naming the real problem which confronted it. [Note that there was no mention of the majority report.]

The second editorial, "Improving Quality of Instruction," 18 November, referred to the Commission's recommendations on the preparation, certification, and professional development of teachers and stated:

> In this area, the commission's work deserves the gratitude of the public and prompt implementation of its basic recommendations by the government.

Basic subjects in the curriculum and forms of testing were commented on in the editorial of 21 November, "Recognition of Fundamentals." The Cameron Commission was credited with having recognized the basic aims of the public school even though "wordily" and in an "over cautious" manner. The fourth editorial in the series entitled, "Central Issue Avoided," 23 November, criticized the Commission in that it skirted or avoided:

> The task of rooting out the "progressivist" influence in the department of education, the faculty of education and the teaching corps.

The Calgary Herald was more stringent in its criticism of the Commission. To quote one example, the editorial of Tuesday, 17 November, was headed "They Missed the Boat." It spoke of the "astonishing misconceptions, misapprehensions and inadequacies in the huge (and bitterly disappointing) document." Attention was drawn to the use of professional jargon, the incomprehensible attack on the separate system, the further "entrenchment" of the progressive philosophy of education. This editorial was only one example of the highly critical stance on education taken by the Calgary Herald (and to a lesser extent, the Edmonton Journal) and it caused the Teachers' Association and the Trustees' Association to send a letter of protest to the Southam Press.[64] This action was in a sense an indirect reaction to the Commission's work, and was an interesting coalition.

The Royal Commission Report received coverage not only in the commercial press but in papers and journals of various groups.[65] These revealed aspects of the reactions of these groups to the Commission's recommendations. The paper of the Students' Union at the University of Alberta, The Gateway, ran two issues in which the Report occupied most or all of the paper. In the latter issue, comments were solicited from various faculty members. The spokesmen for the history and geography departments expressed disappointment at "the vague and incomplete consideration to social studies courses in Alberta High Schools." The professor from political economy thought it was too concerned with "mechanics" whereas he was much impressed by the minority report. He indicated that he had only read the condensed version of the Report in the Edmonton Journal. The Science Faculty were concerned that physical science was still inadequate for those entering science disciplines at the University. The Department of English supported the idea of accreditation and of master teachers and suggested that a teacher would be better equipped for high school teaching with an arts or science degree rather than a master of education degree. Under the title, "Students Get Verbal Lashes," a Calgary Herald report indicated that the Calgary University student paper had turned its attention to the Cameron Report. It praised certain suggestions made by the Commission "before it was shelved in the bureaucratic dust of oblivion" and suggested additional desirable innovations for the Alberta education system.[66]

The Alberta Teachers' Association provided a complete list of the recommendations of the Commission in the December issue of its magazine.[67] As all teachers in the public system of education were members of the Association, each teacher would have received an individual copy only a short time after the Report was made public. In February of 1960, the editorial commented on the Commission's

BELL-FAST BOND

findings with respect to teacher education, stating that these were in accord with the views of the Association; and the March 1960 issue was a complete condensation of the Report prepared by S. C. T. Clarke.[68] The magazine of the Home and School Association of Alberta carried an article by Mrs. Hansen, entitled "Fundamental Principles in the Cameron Report," in February 1960. A later issue reported that committees had been appointed in various branches of the Association to study the Cameron Report and noted that a number of recommendations had already been approved by previous conventions. In the January-February News 1960-1961, notification was given that seminars on the Commission had been held with the aim of informing parents of the Report's content and of deciding on what action was needed to be taken in its regard.[69]

The Alberta School Trustees' Association Journal of January 1960 carried that part of a speech by Senator Cameron to the Farmers' Union of Alberta convention which referred to sections of the majority report, that is, defending the majority position against attack.[70] An example of the public response of the Department of Education was given in a speech by Dr. T. C. Byrne (Chief Superintendent of Schools at the time of the Commission), to the Canadian School Trustees' Association in November of 1960. The topic was accreditation, which it was noted was a major recommendation involving considerable change in the administration of schools and was seen as a way of "countering the trend to provincial uniformity in the educational program."[71] In a Pastoral Letter of 6 March 1960, to be read in all churches, the Roman Catholic Bishops of the province gave a view of the fundamental tenets of Catholic education and expressed their disappointment over the Commission's Report:

> We regret the complete omission in the Majority Report of any evidence that a single recommendation submitted by Catholics received favorable consideration by its signers.[72]

In spite of the efforts of the press, the minority perspective did not develop significant pressure group status. The general acceptance of the Commission's recommendations seemed to suggest a conservative bias in the majority report, giving support to the maintenance of the status quo. The inference which may be drawn is that the establishment of a royal commission was itself perceived as "policy" and thus was sufficient to neutralize extreme dissatisfaction over the education issue. However, there is a second inference, that the conditions of structural conduciveness, strain and generalized beliefs had not been removed by the functioning of the Cameron Commission and that given the emergence of another precipitating factor or other factors, that further action would be required. To test this hypothesis would entail a study similar to the present study, of the Educational Planning Commission of 1969.

Official Reaction

The final part of this section refers to the "official" action on the Report and thus to the degree of implementation of the recommendations of the Commission and some of their effects on policy-making. The terms, implementation and policy, require further explanation. Miklos et al have defined implementation in the following way:

> Implementation is largely a political process of inducing groups or individuals to make particular types of decisions or to adopt specific policies.[73]

A definition of this nature thus admits of degree of implementation. The minister himself, in a speech to the Legislature, used the terminology implementation in whole or in part, or no implementation at all.[74] It follows that implementation occurring as the result of a policy or policies is recognized by some intended change or innovation in a practice or practices at a particular time. Doern and Aucoin have defined policy as:

> A response of the government indicating its position in an area of significant concern to the political system.[75]

With this definition in mind, an attempt to gauge the influence of the Cameron Commission on policy must entail examination of sources indicating the Social Credit government's response to the Commission. However, Doern and Aucoin have added a rider to their definition of policy:

> Most policy is made interstitially and if professional bureaucrats are not likely to participate in the initial formulation of new policies, they are in the long run, quite capable of reformulating them.[76]

This means that the response and the activities of both the government (in the person of the minister of education) and the Department of Education (with its head, the deputy minister), must be investigated including those necessary decisions prior to actual policy-making.

It is important to recognize the machinery that was already available in the Department of Education for studying the Commission's Report. There were sub-committees on curriculum for all levels of the school system as well as the General Curriculum Committee. The Board of Teacher Education and Certification was an established body. The membership of these committees ranged widely amongst professional and lay sectors, education and non-education allied groups. The members, therefore, brought with them their own personal stock of knowledge at hand and knowledge derived from the particular organized group which they represented. Because of the importance of the Royal Commission on Education, the Department established two further committees: the Special Departmental Committee and the Special Ad Hoc Committee for Accreditation. The purpose of the latter committee is clear from its name.

The Special Departmental Committee was composed of senior Departmental officials, the secretary of the Royal Commission and a representative of the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta, Dr. Baker, who had been the consultant for the compilation of the Report. This committee considered the entire two hundred and eighty recommendations one by one; collected and considered further feedback from other committees, groups and individuals, and finally recommended action with respect to each item to the minister and the cabinet. The action was implementation in whole or in part, at some future date or not at all. The final decision rested with the minister and the cabinet, but it would have been unusual for the advice of such an influential body to be disregarded. This then, was the "interstitial" policy-making process.[77]

That the minister had to wait for the Departmental Committee's deliberations was obvious from the apparent inactivity of the government on the report, as well as the fact that many of the recommendations were already in effect or being effected when the Report was released (although this information was not generally known). It was not until March, 1961 that the minister presented his statement of the disposal of recommendations to the Legislature and thus to the electorate.[78] Because of the importance of the statement, the summary has been included here. The accompanying table indicates the classification of recommendations which were accepted conditionally or unconditionally by the province.

Some of the more important features of this distribution will be briefly reviewed. By 1961 eighty-four percent of the recommendations were found in the categories in effect at the time of the Commission, implemented in whole or in part, to be implemented in whole or in part, or to be kept under review with intention of implementing in whole or in part. Of the recommendations, only nine percent had been rejected and the remainder were not classified.

The recommendations rejected or unclassified are shown in Table 4.

The criteria for rejection included: inadvisability of changing present legislation (92); present practice quite satisfactory (175-176, 178-179); recommendations linked with others not favoured by the government (180-183); recommendation related to an area outside the school system (236, 238), or outside provincial jurisdiction (261-263, 265-267); and functions to which recommendation refers already being fulfilled (280). By 1970, however, this category had been reduced to only twelve recommendations. A number of previously rejected recommendations had in fact been implemented. An Educational Planning Commission had been established in 1969. By

TABLE 3

DISPOSAL OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Implemented in whole or in part:

Examinations	5, 6, 7, 9, 14
Curriculum	15-26, 27-37
Subject Fields	38-44, 45-53, 56-61, 62-66, 70-71, 72, 73-81, 84-88, 89-90, 91, 96-99, 100-103, 104-106, 109-111, 112-115
Teacher Education	133, 137-139, 150-152, 155-156
Teacher Salaries	166-167

To be implemented in whole or in part:

Conditions for Teachers	168-169, 171-172, 173-174, 186-187
Superintendents	177
Textbook Supply	197-198
Health Services	199-206
Student Aid	207-210
Special Students	211-213, 214-216, 218-219
School Buses	224
Libraries	228
A.V. and T.V.	239-243, 244-247
School Day	252-254
Indians	264
Separate Schools	269-273
Research	274

To be kept under review:

Accreditation	1-4
Examinations	8-13
Curriculum	20-24, 29-31
Subject Fields	42, 67-69, 75-77, 83, 107-108, 116-117, 119
Community Colleges	120-128
Adult Education	129-130
Teacher Education	131-136, 140-149, 153-154
Teacher Aid	170
Principals	184-185
Guidance	188-196
Residences	225-227
Libraries	229-235, 237
T.V.	248-249
Staff Load	255-256
School Year	257-259
Research	275-279

SOURCE: Statement Regarding Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education, tabled in the Alberta Legislature by the Minister of Education, 17 March 1961. Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

TABLE 4

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS REJECTED OR UNCLASSIFIED

Rejected		Unclassified	
Recommendation Number	Subject of Recommendation	Recommendation Number	Subject of Recommendation
92	French language	33	Curriculum structure
160	Teacher education	54-55	English language
175-179	Locally employed superintendents	64	Mathematics
		82	Physical education
180-183	Regional offices	93-95	Modern languages
221-223	Funding of facilities and equipment	157-165	Teacher salaries
		217-220	Gifted students
226	School buses	268	Separate schools (call for resistance of dual system)
238	Libraries		
250-251	Textbooks		
261	Indian education		
262-267	Separate schools		
280	Educational Planning Commission		

SOURCE: Statement Regarding Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education tabled in the Alberta Legislature by the Minister of Education, 17 March 1961. Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

revision of the School Act locally employed superintendents had become mandatory in 1970. Six regional offices, staffed with consultants, had become part of departmental policy. One point of interest was that the whole topic of merit rating for teachers remained in abeyance with the Alberta Teachers' Association opposition in the matter.[79]

Miklos et al have proposed a number of generalizations which help to account for the decisions made in respect of implementation. Because of their grounding in careful analysis, a condensed version of the generalizations had been included:[80]

TABLE 5

GENERALIZATIONS CONCERNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Conditions encouraging implementation:

1. In accord with policies/practices of groups to which recommendations were directed
2. Approved by senior Departmental officials
3. Favourable initial reaction and support from influential groups
4. Reflected existing practices
5. Supportive social, economic and educational conditions
6. No feasible alternatives to achieve specific and desired conditions

Conditions discouraging implementation:

1. Matters internal to groups contrary to their policy/practices
2. Lack of support from a major group
3. No apparent benefit to groups to which directed
4. Groups not directly concerned opposing recommendations
5. Unclear recommendations
6. Political overtones
7. Differences among groups sharing equal responsibility for implementation
8. Not derived from policy of a major group

SOURCE: E. Miklos et al, "Implementation of Recommendations made by the Alberta Royal Commission on Education, 1959." (University of Alberta, November 1970). (Typewritten.)

These generalizations were derived from an examination of the comments attached to the minister's statement on implementation and from policies and practices within the Alberta education system at a later date.

The Commission's ability to assess what might have been feasible for educational change in the Alberta context was indicated by the fact that a large number of its recommendations were already implemented or being implemented at the time of the Commission. This suggestion gains further credence by the small number of recommendations which were rejected. The recommendations reflected the views of the major groups responsible for decision-making and implementation of decisions in Alberta education. This would seem to support the contention that the input and output of the Commission were selectively controlled.

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter continued the analysis of the Royal Commission in Alberta by applying structural-functional concepts from the normative paradigm. The Commission conceived as a social system institutionalized for a two year period, was found to be a complex set of interdependent social relations oriented to produce knowledge and policy relative to education in Alberta. It was indicated that the linkages of the Commission with outside social systems were more strongly developed in relation to professional education than to local and voluntary persons and agencies. It was shown that there were strains within the Commission as a social system associated with the production of a minority as well as a majority report. It was further shown that when the Commission's work was officially ended, there was initiated a rather lengthy process of deinstitutionalizing and destructuring the Commission as debate on the work of the Commission, reorganization of government and other agencies to implement or reformulate the Commission recommendations continued.

With respect to the Commission, it was found that three broad areas received extensive treatment—curriculum, authority in the system and the teaching profession. These matters were dealt with in great detail by the majority report and tended to support the direction of educational policy at the time. However, in relation to the strains which led to the eventual establishment of the Royal Commission, the majority report concentrated mainly on problems associated with standards, the teaching profession—its quality and preparation, and to a limited extent with the local/provincial hiatus. Logistics, the actual supply of teachers and facilities in relation to the student population, were handled in rather straightforward recommendations. The majority report was deliberately defined as eclectic as far as values were concerned and stayed well within the bounds of the normative level of conceptualizing the resolution of educational problems. A great many regulations, a few new agencies and an adequate flow of facilities were the essence of the majority report. The dominant power relationships were reflected in the Commission's recommendations and in the structural-functional links assumed or taken for granted with such groups as the Faculty of Education and the Alberta Teachers' Association.

On the other hand, the minority report growing out of conflict within the Commission itself, took the debate on education from the normative, role and facility level to the value level of concern. It was clearly concerned with the local-provincial hiatus in calling for more parental control in education and indirectly, for a greater input from the Church. The essentialist philosophy of education which it championed, if accepted, would have put a set of values in focus which would govern the other aspects of Alberta's education—the norms, the roles, the facilities. It was a latent call for revolutionary change in education at the level of values and when such a call is made detailed recommendations prove to be an encumbrance, or at least a secondary consideration. This was illustrated by the emphasis of the minority report. It also helps to explain the role performance of the minority commissioner.

As shown in the examination of the termination and destructuring phase of the Commission, it was clear that the Commission itself had resolved few educational problems. The continuing interest of the commissioners in the debate on the Commission's recommendations is one indication that they themselves did not look back upon their work as concluded when their roles were officially over. During the destructuring phase, they become potential agitators or prophets for further collective behaviour in education.

As professional and voluntary associations connected with education received the Report, they along with the government and Department of Education were already in process of organizing themselves to carry out certain of the recommendations. Thus the destructuring of the Commission itself was a process which had begun before the Commission was effectively terminated. This process gained its greatest momentum in the two years following the Royal Commission. It was helped by critical comments from the public and the media. Throughout the life of the Commission and also its destructuring, the government of the day and the Commission itself attempted to preserve, both ideologically and behaviourally, participation in educational policy-making by the public of Alberta. The analysis of the present chapter showed that the main participants in policy-making tended to be the professional educators. This finding raises important questions about the nature and control of knowledge in education which need examination.

The present chapter has been concerned with answering "how" and "what" questions about the Commission from the perspective of structural-functional theory. It concentrated on multifaceted variables—personnel, materials, facilities, the structure and process of the Commission, its official output and its termination. It is now possible, using this analysis as a background, to examine the Royal Commission from the standpoint of knowledge production and control.

Footnotes

[1] The term "destructuring" is used by Marcel Rioux (1961) in the section "Itinéraires Socioliques," Recherches Sociographiques 15 (1974): 312.

[2] G. Rocher, A General Introduction to Sociology: A Theoretical Perspective (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1972), p. 266. The Commission may also be described in terms of the Loomis model of a social system: C. P. Loomis, Social Systems (Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1960), p. 8.

[3] N. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 32.

[4] Order-in-Council 2009/57, Edmonton, December 31st, 1957, p. 2.

[5] Ibid., pp. 2-4. For the full text of the terms of reference, see Appendix B2.

[6] Ibid., pp. 1-2.

[7] Taken from interviews with Mr. Aalborg, 27 May 1974 and Dr. Swift, 29 May 1974.

[8] Schutzian terminology introduced in chapter two. These concepts are used to emphasize the importance of not merely taking for granted official statuses and roles, but of adopting a phenomenological perspective of looking at the person occupying such a status and role.

[9] Short biographical profiles of the Commissioners have been included in Appendix C.

[10] G. Henderson, Federal Royal Commissions in Canada 1867-1966: A Checklist (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), p. xi. Reference was made to the cost of Canadian commissions in chapter two.

[11] Interview with Mr. A. Aalborg, former Minister of Education, 27 May 1974.

[12] The statement of the Provincial Treasurer, Hon. E. Hinman, was reported in the Edmonton Journal, 7 April 1960, p. 22.

[13] The differentiation between "folk/public" and "research/expert" knowledge was made by Dr. R. MacArthur, former research director of the Commission, during an interview on 25 June 1974.

[14] This information was volunteered by a number of the commissioners and confirmed by the Minister himself during interviews. See Appendix E.

[15] C. Goulson, "An Historical Survey of Royal Commissions and Other Major Governmental Inquiries in Canadian Education" (D.Ed. thesis, University of Toronto, 1966), p. 8.

[16] G. Doern and P. Aucoin, The Structures of Policy-Making in Canada (Toronto: Macmillan, 1971), p. 118.

[17] The Index of Minutes has been included in Appendix DI.1 and is evidence of the strategies of operation of the Commission.

[18] For example, The Albertan, 11 January 1958, p. 6.

[19] "The Cameron Commission," The ATA Magazine 38 (1958): 15-18.

[20] Secretary's letter to Dr. W. Murray of Edmonton, Commission Files, Department of Education Archives (n.d.).

[21] Contributed by Mrs. Taylor in interview, 28 May 1974.

[22] Confirmed during interview with the Commission Secretary, Dr. R. Rees, 30 May 1974. A list of hearings to indicate the opportunities given to the public has been included in Appendix DI.4.

[23] Interview with Dr. W. Swift, 29 May 1974. Dr. Swift appeared before the Commission with respect to the issue of non-acceptance of Alberta matriculants into universities in other provinces—a controversial point at the time.

[24] A list of these submissions and a summary of the main points have been included in Appendix DI.3.

[25] Gained from interview with Dr. Rees, 30 May 1974.

[26] Discussed in interviews with Dr. Rees, 30 May 1974 and Dr. MacArthur, 25 June 1974. A list of research projects as referred to in the Commission's Report has been included in Appendix DI.5.

[27] Minutes of the 2nd Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 29-30 January 1958, made reference to this matter.

[28] Brought out in interviews with Mrs. Taylor, 28 May 1974 and Mrs. Hansen, 6 June 1974; one such instance was cited in the Minutes of the 18th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 20-22 January 1959.

[29] Minutes of the 22nd Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 18-19 February 1959 and the 23rd Regular Meeting, 23-25 February 1959.

[30] Perusal of the Index of Minutes provides some guide to the tasks of the commissioners. For example:

See: Item 7 - Agenda of Minutes December 30, 1957
Item 18 - Agenda of Minutes January 29-30, 1958
Item 25 - Agenda of Minutes January 29-30, 1958
Item 26 - Agenda of Minutes January 29-30, 1958
Item 52 - Agenda of Minutes January 29-30, 1958
Item 53 - Agenda of Minutes February 24-26, 1958
Item 67 - Agenda of Minutes April 18, 1958
Item 103 - Agenda of Minutes April 18, 1958
Item 107 - Agenda of Minutes June 13, 1958.

[31] Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1959), p. v.

[32] Ibid., p. 7.

[33] Copy obtained from Royal Commission files, Department of Education Archives.

[34] Derived from Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

[35] Major Issues Brought out in Briefs. A Summary of the Consolidation as Prepared by Mr. Brown. Commission files, Department of Education Archives.

[36] See section in chapter four on Function of the Commission and Appendix DI.2.

[37] Report of the Royal Commission on Education, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

[38] An incomplete file of submissions found in the Department of Education Archives has been placed in Appendix DI.3.

[39] Minutes of the Committee of the Royal Commission on Education, 9 September 1958.

[40] The Albertan, 27 February 1958, p. 5. This item reported the proposed meeting of June 9 and 10 1958.

[41] Report of the Royal Commission on Education, op. cit., p. 9.

[42] Ibid., Appendix C.

[43] Order-in-Council 2009/57. Edmonton, December 31st, 1957, p. 6.

[44] Information tendered in interviews with Mr. Aalborg, 27 May 1974, and Senator Manning, 2 July 1974.

[45] See Minutes of the following meetings of the Royal Commission on Education:
6th Regular Meeting, 29-30 July 1958
Committee Meeting, 11 September 1958
Appendix to Minutes, 11th Regular Meeting, 10-12 November 1958
19th Regular Meeting, 27-30 January 1959
20th Regular Meeting, 4-6 February 1959
29th Regular Meeting, 28-30 April 1959
30th Regular Meeting, 11-15 May 1959
33rd Regular Meeting, 2-4 June 1959
34th Regular Meeting, 8-11 June 1959
35th Regular Meeting, 15-19 June 1959
36th Regular Meeting, 4 July 1959
37th Regular Meeting, 30 September-1 October 1959
38th Regular Meeting, 23-28 October 1959
39th Regular Meeting, 1-3 November 1959.

[46] Minutes of 35th Regular Meeting of the Commission on Education, 15-19 June 1959. Item 280—indicated that various members had agreed to put in final form sections of the report. For example, Senator Cameron was responsible for i) agricultural schools, ii) technical institutes, iii) driver training, iv) dormitories (school residences), v) scholarships; Mrs. Hansen, i) aims of education, ii) aids to teaching (TV); Mrs. Taylor, provision of library facilities; Dr. Mowat, i) religious education, ii) scholarships (with Senator Cameron).

[47] Minutes of 37th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 30 September-1 October 1958.

[48] Reports of these meetings were carried by the provincial papers; interviews with commissioners yielded anecdotal comment on this matter and Mrs. Hansen and Mrs. Taylor tendered speeches they had given, for the researcher's perusal.

[49] Reference to one such conference is made in the Minutes of 39th Regular Meeting of the Commission, 1-3 November 1959—Report of the final press conference was made in the Edmonton Journal, 16 November 1959, pp. 1-2, 6-8.

[50] Minutes of 4th Regular Meeting of the Commission, 24-25 March 1958. Item 83. The Secretary was to provide news releases periodically indicating the nature of the work of the Commission, mentioning briefs and naming those submitting briefs and outlining research projects without financial detail. The Edmonton Journal, 2 September 1958, p. 3, carried such a communiqué indicating in advance the Commission's schedule of hearings for a 15 day session to be held in the Jubilee Auditorium and some of the 29 briefs to be heard.

[51] One reaction to the release of the Report can be noted in the editorial of The Albertan, 17 November 1959, p. 5, which

9

commenced: "The first thing to remember about the monumental Cameron Commission Report on education in Alberta is that it is the findings of five very competent citizens after a most thorough and exhaustive investigation at which every interested person had the right to submit evidence and opinions and hundreds did. This is the last word on every phase of education, and for some years it will be impossible to approach the subject intelligently without at least a reference to the Cameron report. The second thing to remember is that the commissioners who signed the report are not infallible or omniscient, and that the report lacks divine inspiration."

The article then went on to support the stand taken by the Minority Report and the recommendations of driver training, teachers' salaries, master teacher concept and professionalism while criticizing the recommendation on French. The recommendations on Alberta standards, teacher training, technical training and the educational planning commission received no definite response but were merely mentioned.

A typical news item reporting an aspect of the Commission's work can be seen in the Edmonton Journal, 20 May 1958, p. 27, which outlined the briefs heard on the previous day and their main points (at Wainwright on 19th May).

[52] Judith Willer, The Social Determination of Knowledge (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 18.

[53] One example related to an interview with a group of superintendents, from Minutes of the 17th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 5-8 January 1959.

[54] This point was brought out in interview with Dr. R. S. MacArthur, former research director of the Commission. Interview 25 June 1974.

[55] This impression was gained from interviews with commissioners.

[56] There was apparently some concern over Mr. Cormack's absences from the Commission because a memorandum was attached to the Minutes of the 17th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, that a letter be sent to Commissioner Cormack indicating the schedule of further meetings and emphasizing the importance of attendance.

[57] For example, the Index of Minutes lists Item 268—Minority Report, in Minutes of the 32nd Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 25-29 May 1959. In the meetings held 15-19 June 1959 and 4 July 1959, motions were passed on the procedures to be adopted in the event that a commissioner wished to present a minority report (Minutes of the 35th and 36th Regular Meetings of the Royal Commission on Education).

[58] The author of the minority report defined "progressivism" as Deweyism and "essentialism" as congruent with the views of the philosophers Maritain and Brubacher. He contrasted the two orientations on their main characteristics (as he saw them); for example, progressivism demanded concentration on social acceptance through desirable behaviour and attitudes, as a corollary downgraded the accumulation of knowledge. Essentialism emphasized that the child must be taught, self-learning is a wasteful process, and that the student must master a pre-determined curriculum. For the complete discussion, see the Minority Report, pp. 359-451.

[59] In a news item on the minority report in the Calgary Herald, 16 November 1959, p. 2, the charge was made that "the progressive system and its inherent characteristics of centralization of rural schools, preoccupation with social aspects of life, the classroom and its view that the 'whole child goes to school,' 'has driven a wedge between the child and his parents'—this is not what parents want, control has been taken out of the hands of parents and placed in those of professionals."

[60] Edmonton Journal, 16 November 1959, Front page;
Calgary Herald, 16 November 1959, Front page;
The Albertan, 16 November 1959, Front page.

After the front page columns, all of the newspapers continued their reports, dispersing them through inner pages. It is difficult in the case of newspapers to differentiate a straightout presentation of the facts from presentations made for reasons such as enhancing the news value of the item, or a deliberate attempt to influence the reader in a certain way. In this chapter, it has been considered worthwhile to indicate some of the possible latent purposes.

[61] "Cameron School Report Lauded: Minority Report Criticized," Edmonton Journal, 2 February 1960; "Five Major Problems Posed by Cameron Education Report," Edmonton Journal, 8 April 1960, p. 10; "ATA Brief Requests Higher Qualifications for Teachers," Edmonton Journal, 5 August 1960, p. 28; "Calgary Member Repeats Demand that Education Minister Resign," Edmonton Journal, 22 March 1961, p. 3; "School Centralization Hits Minority Groups," Edmonton Journal, 21 March 1962, p. 3.

[62] "Cameron Replies to Criticism of Report on Education," Edmonton Journal, 11 December 1959, p. 45; "Cormack Defends Minority Report: Reveals Rejection of Study Plea," Calgary Herald, 20 February 1960, p. 5; "Criticism of Reports Termed Very Serious," Calgary Herald, 25 February 1960, p. 29; "Generation Said Sacrificed on Altar of Progressivism," Calgary Herald, 31 March 1960, p. 40; "Cameron Commission Member Objects to School Foundation Plan," Edmonton Journal, 17 March 1961, p. 46.

[63] "Quality and Essentials in School," Edmonton Journal, 17 November 1959, p. 4; "Improving Quality of Instruction," Edmonton

Journal, 18 November 1959, p. 4; "Recognition of Fundamentals," Edmonton Journal, 21 November 1959, p. 4; "Central Issue Avoided," Edmonton Journal, 23 November 1959, p. 4. The paper's support of the "traditionalist" philosophical orientation can be detected throughout these editorials.

[64] "They Missed the Boat," Calgary Herald, 17 November 1959, p. 4. Professional educators at school and university level and civil servants concerned with education had been disturbed by what they viewed as excessive criticism by the Southam Press over a period of time. The reaction of the press to the Cameron Report was a further example; the concern of these groups was that without access to the Report itself, people would be prejudiced by the "biased" reporting in the two major papers which were in an almost monopoly position in the province. Comments in this matter were made by a number of the key influentials interviewed; for example, Dr. Coutts, Dr. Swift, Dr. Clarke. Reference was also made to the influence of such comment on the morale in the Faculty of Education in a letter of December 31st, 1959 from Dean Coutts to the President of the University—discovered in the President's Files, University Archives.

[65] The Gateway, 17 November 1959, pp. 2-6, contained a condensation of certain features of the Report while the entire issue of 26 November 1959 consisted of comments by university faculty members on the recommendations of the Commission.

[66] Calgary Herald, 11 February 1961, p. 18. The students' paper, The Gauntlet, extended the recommendations from the Cameron Report which it approved such as strengthening the academic content of courses, lengthening the school day and applying character, personality and health criteria in teacher selection with suggestions of its own with a greater relevance for university study, for example, abolishing the high school credit system in favour of core academic courses and setting up summer reading requirements and accelerated classroom courses.

[67] The ATA Magazine 40 (1959): 22-38.

[68] The ATA Magazine 40 (1960): 4-5; The ATA Magazine 40 (1960): Entire issue.

[69] Home and School News 11 (1960): 1-2; Home and School News 11 (1960): 3; Home and School News 12 (1961): 7.

[70] The Alberta School Trustee 30 (1960): 9-15.

[71] "Accreditation for Alberta Schools" (November 1960): 542-554, contained in Collected Speeches and Writings, vol. 2, Dr. T. C. Byrne, Athabasca University, November 1971. In interview, Dr. Byrne expressed the view that the recommendation on accreditation was one of the "radical" recommendations in an otherwise conservative Report.

[72] Pastoral Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of Alberta, March 1960. A copy was found in the President's Files, University of Alberta Archives.

[73] E. Miklos et al, "Implementation of Recommendations made by the Alberta Royal Commission on Education, 1959," a report prepared for the Commission on Educational Planning (University of Alberta, November 1970). (Typewritten) p. 41. This material was made available by Dr. Miklos, Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration in the University of Alberta.

[74] Statement Regarding Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education, tabled in the Alberta Legislature by the Minister of Education, 17 March 1961, p. 1.

[75] G. Doern and P. Aucoin, op. cit., p. 22.

[76] Ibid., p. 126.

[77] Reference to the Special Committee was found in a number of documents in the Commission Files in the Department of Education Archives. These papers indicated the membership of the Committee, including Messrs. Berry, Evenson, Purvis, Aldridge, Conquest, Swift, Watts, Byrne, Smith and Rees and listed recommendations which had been discussed with comments on whether or not they were approved. These lists were very incomplete but the sections remaining gave a good indication of the functioning of the Committee. The interview with Dr. W. Swift, 29 May 1974, verified the structure and function of the Committee and supplied the interpretation that the government accepted the recommendations for action forwarded by the Committee.

[78] Statement Regarding Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education, tabled in the Alberta Legislature by the Minister of Education, 17 March 1961. Copy obtained from the Commission files, Department of Education Archives; also found in the Journal of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Alberta 65 (February 16-April 12, 1961).

[79] E. Miklos et al, "Implementation of Recommendations made by the Alberta Royal Commission on Education, 1959," op. cit.

[80] Ibid., pp. 38-40.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE CAMERON COMMISSION: A SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

One feature of the present study has been the attempt to use two sets of conceptual tools to analyze one educational phenomenon. In chapter three, the emergence of the Commission was considered while chapter four dealt with the structure and function of the Commission as an on-going social system. This analysis was in terms of the normative paradigm. In this chapter the focus is on the reciprocal relationship between social structure and knowledge. The sociology of knowledge perspective, part of the interpretative paradigm, places the Commission as a mediating variable in the dialectic between individuals, groups and their ideas on educational problems and solutions in Alberta. For the purpose of the study, some aspects from phenomenological sociology have been introduced to underscore the importance of taking account of the interaction of individuals as well as groups, and to encourage the treating as problematic of assumptions about knowledge, of the Commission and of those contributing to it or reacting to it.

Within a sociology of knowledge framework, a deliberate attempt is made to focus more on the "why" questions rather than the "what" or "how" questions which were the main concern of the two preceding chapters. In this quest, material provided by chapters three or four is re-examined along with other data from primary and secondary sources. The aim of this chapter is no longer accurate description but interpretation and explanation. From the more subtle and complex analysis attempted here, while the production of valid knowledge remains the scientific ideal, the most that can be anticipated is a high level of plausibility.

The present chapter continues a process begun in chapter three in which the problematic nature of the origins of the Royal Commission was considered. The main concerns have now shifted to knowledge management as a central focus of the Commission, and the power and control dimensions in the temporary undertaking by the Commission of society's role in selecting, classifying, distributing, transmitting and evaluating public educational knowledge.[1] These concerns extend the inquiry into the problematic aspects of knowledge within the Royal Commission and also within the Alberta education system and society. This means that, sociologically, the Commission is not to be taken solely as a fact of institutionalization but as a "product of social arrangements,"[2] an array of interrelated activities of people—politicians, administrators, educators, members of voluntary organized groups—all of whom had their own "vocabulary of motives."[3] By "vocabulary of motives" is meant their typical language used to describe particular social and educational situations. Their motivated behaviour underlies the political and ideological aspects of Alberta's Royal Commission on Education.

Before beginning the analysis from a sociology of knowledge perspective, a moment may be taken to place the Royal Commission into the power context of the Alberta government and its education system. The Royal Commission was an admission by the Alberta government of its concern with educational policy and its own inability to develop and implement policies to deal effectively with the province's educational problems. In terms of Lasswell's conceptualization of policy in relation to power outcomes,[4] with which the government was ultimately concerned, the Royal Commission was first of all to engage in the gathering, processing and disseminating of information or the intelligence function in policy-making. The other components of policy making—promotion, prescription, invocation, application, termination, appraisal would normally be deferred until after the Commission had completed its report. It is argued in this chapter that not only was the knowledge produced by the Royal Commission problematic but also that the output of the Commission tended to be problematic in relation to the power outcomes of Alberta policies, and particularly the policies respecting education. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to pursue this inquiry to the fullest extent. However, it is hoped that the stress on the problematic nature of both knowledge and power outcomes will be valuable in formulating questions that might be asked in further studies of this inquiry or other public inquiries on education.

The complexity of the analysis in this chapter derives partly from the necessity to take into account at least two definitions of power and control. The Royal Commission under consideration was a social system which overlapped both the political and the education systems in Alberta. For this reason, one must differentiate between power and control in policy terms and power and control in knowledge terms, while at the same time keeping both in view.

The Royal Commission's legal mandate was to evolve recommendations for policy. Within this framework, the concept of power as manifest, legitimate power is appropriate.[5] This kind of power is similar to that which inheres in an office in a formal organization. Here the incumbent exerts control because he has the right to initiate decisions and allocate scarce resources. It will be noted that power and control are being used in conjunction because they are difficult to separate operationally.[6] An important focus of this chapter is therefore power exercised by the Royal Commission in its work leading to policy outcomes.

To use power and control to relate to educational knowledge and the Royal Commission, requires a somewhat different perspective. The meaning of power and control must be derived from a number of interrelated statements. The first is the acceptance of education as socially and historically constructed. Implicit in this description is the idea that educational knowledge may be defined in various ways at different times by different social groups. The most widely accepted definition will be that proposed by the dominant group, that is, the group with sufficient power to impose its definition on others.[7] The second statement is the recognition that people in any society experience differential access to education, and thus, educational knowledge. There is control over who gets education. This represents one political or power aspect of education in the sense that knowledge per se is power. People who know more things, ordinarily can control more situations. Thirdly, there appears to be a correlation between level of education and occupation, and thus occupational rewards, which indicates that the education system itself exerts a form of social control in relation to access to power from occupational sources.

Another relationship of educational power and knowledge relates to the process of knowledge transmission as defined by Daine:

> Educational knowledge can be regarded as an imposed definition of reality. It is the set of meanings which those who have power over the dissemination process choose to make available to other members of society. It is not so much the position, but the relation of that position to the dissemination process of educational knowledge, which determines control.[8]

In these terms, it can be hypothesized that the Royal Commission on Education, initiated, developed, collected and processed a variety of definitions of educational reality but chose to disseminate only some of them by way of its recommendations. This hypothesis needs to be explored. What is at stake here is metacontrol, control of controls, control of the access to power through knowledge.

The matter of power and control needs consideration from yet another perspective in the sociology of knowledge, a perspective supplemented by phenomenological sociology. According to Dawe:

> The concept of control refers essentially to social relationships . . . it integrates actors into interaction systems.[9]

In the light of this concept, it becomes important to consider the behaviour of Commission members, their interaction within the Commission and their interactions with persons and groups external to the Commission, as factors in the control of knowledge by the Commission. From this perspective, every recommendation and definition of the Royal Commission can be seen as an instance of social interaction and related to the minds and behaviours of the actors.[10] In this sense, the control of knowledge by the Commission is not taken for granted but is problematic.

A further complexity of the analysis from the sociology of knowledge perspective is introduced with the concept of management of knowledge, which is closely associated with control as described above. Thus, educational knowledge can be viewed in Young's terms,

> as neither absolute, nor arbitrary, but as 'available sets of meanings,' which in any educational context do not merely 'emerge' but are collectively 'given.'[11]

Therefore, in a sociological analysis of a particular Royal Commission, the educational knowledge with which it dealt must be treated as a constructed reality. The Commission utilized the processes of selection, classification, distribution, transmission and evaluation with regard to public educational knowledge, and in this way managed knowledge. Such a view opens up the possibilities of alternative interpretations of both the knowledge input and output of the Commission. In other words, it suggests the problematic aspects of knowledge management by the Commission.

The present chapter is divided into three parts. The first deals with knowledge management, power and control in an effort to examine the problematic nature of the Commission arising from the way it was socially arranged and controlled within the context of government in Alberta. The second part is concerned with the interaction taking place within the Commission itself and the consequence of this interaction for knowledge production and the power outcomes of the Commission. Again, an emphasis is placed on the problematic nature of both knowledge and power outcomes arising from the interaction within the Commission. The third part of the chapter extends the discussion to an examination of the interests and groups outside the Royal Commission to show how these influenced the knowledge and power of the Commission. Throughout the chapter, an attempt is made as often as possible by combining empirical observation with insights from theory to suggest why the Commission's knowledge and power was as it was or appeared to be.

The Commission in Relation to the Policy Context of the Alberta Government

As a social system in its own right, the Royal Commission as shown in chapters three and four had a life of its own made up of four phases, official creation culminating in an order-in-council, organizational phase during which membership was recruited and assigned roles, operating phase in which the work of the Commission was done, and the termination phase in which the Commission was destructured. The Royal Commission during its lifetime was an integral part of the government's decision process. It is hypothesized that the interaction between the Royal Commission and the government at each phase of the Commission's duration, to the extent there was interaction, contributed to the problematic nature of policy and knowledge outcomes in both the Royal Commission and government. It is further hypothesized that government control of policy and knowledge was exerted during each of these phases of the Commission's life. These hypotheses must now be explored.

Official Creation Phase

The Commission's official creation and organizational phases overlapped in time. The culmination of the creation phase was the Order-in-Council of December 31,1957.[12] The terms of reference stated in this document became the mandate for the Commission, indicating that it would have an intelligence function in the government's process of forming educational policy. There could be no direct interaction during the creation phase between the Commission, which did not exist, and the government. Some of the government's actions at this time can be seen to have influenced the work of the Commission in planned and unplanned ways. Four instances are briefly reviewed.

The first instance, during the creation phase, was the establishment on September 9,1957 of an Advisory Committee to help draft the terms of reference, which had been prepared by the government and considered by the Department of Education.[13] This was a manifest function for the Advisory Committee. However, when the Royal Commission published its report in 1959, the work of the Advisory Committee was referred to as useful but limited, and was evidence of the need for a commission to undertake the "extensive and disciplined study" of Alberta education's complex problems.[14] What was designed and appeared to be a facility for creating the Commission was reinterpreted during the two years and became a reason for the Commission.

The second instance is one of attempted control of the scope of the Commission. The terms of reference asked the Commission to look at "the elementary and secondary levels" in Alberta, including school economic factors, but excluding "detailed study of sources of funds and procedures for obtaining and distributing them."[15] These two restrictions served to channel most of the Commission's attention, as expected. However, there was room for a problematic outcome from the Commission implied in the injunction in the terms of reference for the Commission to conduct their inquiry of a suggested list of subjects "without restricting their consideration of any aspects."[16] The Commission's report, as could be predicted, dealt mostly with elementary and secondary education. Only one four page chapter was devoted to school finance. However, two much longer chapters, prepared at the insistence of the chairman, dealt with the Community College and Adult Education, which were his own areas of career and professional interest.[17] Any opportunity to do something for the community college and adult education was one of the chairman's admitted motivations for accepting the Commission's chairmanship.[18] In this instance, a creational phase factor interacted with an organizational phase factor to yield an unplanned outcome so far as the government's initial planning of the Commission was concerned.

The third instance of government effect on the Royal Commission from the creation phase was its failure to define "education" in the terms of reference. As the work of the Commission progressed, the Commission often tried to define the aims of education, through a commissioned study, and by questions to those who appeared before the Commission.[19] In this quest for educational aims, the question of what was "education" kept intruding, and was not dealt with in the Majority report. However, it was dealt with at length in the Minority report, which did have a definition of education.[20] The lack of any attempt initially by the government to define what it meant by education, in retrospect, became a facilitating factor in the development of a minority position within the Commission. Other factors associated with the development of this position are considered later in this chapter. This instance, together with the preceding two, indicates the impact of creation phase actions by government on the work and outcomes for policy and knowledge of the Royal Commission.

Organizational Phase

The influence of the government on the Royal Commission originating in the Commission's organizational phase has already been introduced in chapter four. It is important to bring into clearer perspective the relationship of this influence on knowledge and policy. One instance has been cited, the appointment of a chairman whose career and professional interests led to two chapters in the Commission Report which went beyond the Commission's terms of reference. As this line of inquiry is followed, it is seen that the entire Commission was potentially changed by the government decision to call as members only Albertans, and not to draw on other provinces, a decision endorsed by the Alberta Teachers' Association representative to the Advisory Committee during discussion of selection of members.[21] However, the decision had the effect of creating a Commission membership which not only represented a cross-section of Alberta society, but which had its own collections of informal and formal social networks and its own array of audiences. Specific interests and interest groups were represented within the Commission. The most striking instance of the problematic nature of the Commission outcomes in relation to knowledge and policy associated with Commission membership is the Minority report. At one point in the Commission's work, Mrs. Taylor, representing the rural organizations indicated she might wish to present a minority report on teacher education, with the needs of rural Alberta in mind.[22]

Another dimension of the Commission organization phase was the selection and appointment of support staff. Whereas selection of Commission members tended to increase the problematic aspects of the Commission, a price no doubt acceptable to the government from the point of view of reconciling and giving ear to diverging interests within the province, the support staff appointments appeared to reflect a control and predictability concern. The Secretary, a former Faculty of Education professor, and at that time a high school inspector, was informed of his appointment. His willingness to take the post was not sought, but taken for granted by the Deputy Minister of Education.[23] The Research Director appointed from the Faculty of Education, was completing his appointment as the Assistant Director of the Kellogg Project in Canadian Educational Administration, headquartered at the University of Alberta. He was called to his position after a meeting of the University President, Dean of the Faculty, and the Chairman of his Department.[24]

The manner of both appointments suggested that a highly predictable role performance was anticipated. These appointments contributed to the expertise power of the Commission, a fact reflected particularly in the case of the secretary, who made a field study of mathematics teaching by closed circuit television in the United States and who contributed a special summary on Indian education to the Commission.[25] Here staff expertise transcended the expectations of a commission secretary, and contributed to the knowledge outcomes of the Commission in ways not anticipated at the time of his appointment. In this sense government decision again is shown to have influenced the Commission's output of knowledge and policy.

The research director's expertise was not challenged nor exploited, but was taken for granted by both government and Commission. However, his choice of personnel to do contract research, appeared to reflect not only the Commission's interest in specific research questions, but also university contacts of the research director. Of the six persons chosen to do special studies, one was a professor of educational methods in mathematics, three were professors or graduate students in educational psychology, two were from the Department of Educational Administration, and one was an economist.[26] An examination of the research reports discloses a strong leaning towards empirical, descriptive survey research with very little utilization of theory.[27] The research knowledge produced by and for the Commission appears to be associated with the organizational selection of research director by the University for the government.

Operational Phase

The operational phase of a Royal Commission is, in the ideal type of this Canadian institution, the phase where the Commission is most independent of any governmental inputs, except those it requests in the performance of its mission to produce "intelligence." In the case of the Cameron Commission this ideal type was diluted in at least three ways as interaction with government occurred. The first was an ecological interaction. The Commission was assigned space in the same building as the Department of Education. The space was limited, and there was a feeling that independence away from the Department was needed. At the request of the Commission a new premise was found in an office building on Edmonton's Jasper Avenue.[28] From data available, it is not possible to determine the specific nature or extent of the effect of government interaction that occurred in the two ecological settings of the Commission. It can only be inferred that the request to move did have some indeterminate effect on what the Commission was able to produce on knowledge and policy, and in the rate and ease of informal knowledge exchange between government and Commission during the operational phase.

A second way in which the ideal was diluted was the practice which evolved for the chairman to report the progress of the Commission to the Minister of Education in informal conversations, which were known by the other commissioners to take place, and which it can be assumed they approved.[29] In the later part of the operating phase, the Minister was informed of internal disagreement with the possibility of a minority report. Again, there is not sufficient data to say what the specific outcomes of these informal exchanges were. It can only be hypothesized that they contributed to some of the government's and the Commission's decisions in the termination phase, to be discussed presently.

A third interaction of government and Commission took place during the operational phase. It was the receipt of a letter from the Minister stating that the Commission was not to exceed an expenditure of $7,500 for commissioned research.[30] The effect of this communication was to restrain the Commission from initiating research in addition to that already in progress. In this sense, the government was acting coercively as an agent of control over the knowledge output of the Commission.

The fourth, and possibly the most significant interaction took place during the last months of the operating phase. This was strong pressure from the government, communicated through the chairman, to bring the Commission's work to a speedy conclusion.[31] The reasons are not fully explained in data available, though one explanation offered was that urgency of educational problems being dealt with by the Commission was rapidly diminishing and the Commission should end its inquiry before it was outdated.[32] Whatever the reason, this interaction had a number of consequences for both government and Commission. For the Commission the most important consequence was that the termination phase of the Commission was greatly accelerated. Other consequences are considered in relation to the termination phase.

Termination Phase—Early Period

The termination phase of the Royal Commission began officially November 9, 1959, when the Commission's Report was handed to the Lieutenant Governor. As will be shown later in the chapter, the complete and official ending of the Cameron Royal Commission in terms of the government's decision process was implicit in the June 1969 Order-in-Council which proclaimed the establishment of the Alberta Educational Planning Commission.[33] Of immediate concern here is the early period of the termination phase which deals with government interaction in relation to the publication, dissemination and early discussion of the Report, and its treatment of the Commission members and staff.

Unofficially the Commission's termination phase may be said to have originated in communication by the government to the Commission through its chairman that the Commission should terminate its work soon. The Commission's response came October 1, 1959, in approving the following agenda for concluding its official activities.

> Item 287 - Time Scheduling—re Report.
>
> (a) The first problem was to have the report written, a task which Dr. Mowat proposed be completed by October 3rd.
> (b) This would then be edited and mimeographed by October 14, following which all sections would be passed to the Commissioners.
> (c) Commissioners would proceed to study the report and to register their reservations and dissensions in writing by October 19, as a basis for discussion.
> (d) Points at issue will be discussed during the period, October 23-31, for the purpose of resolving differences.
> (e) Having dealt with fundamental issues to decide whether a basis exists for a minority report, it was agreed that minority reports should be submitted to the Chairman not later than November 5th, and if possible within one week from agreement or disagreement on points of issue.

(f) It was agreed that the complete report, including minority reports, should be delivered to the Government early in November.

Item 288 - Organization of Report.

The organization of the report under sections was considered desirable. This task was assigned to Drs. Mowat, Rees and Baker, to be completed by October 14.[34]

The adoption of this agenda, which was an internal Commission interaction, had the very important effect of disallowing commissioner Cormack's suggestion that "the whole philosophy of education be reviewed and that the report should set out a definite philosophy," and his expressed desire to extend the Commission for six months for this purpose.[35] This decision, ostensibly based on the urgency of producing a report, left no alternative but for commissioners to permit, and for Mr. Cormack whose views could not be accommodated, to submit a minority report. The overall structure of the report itself was thus shaped. While a single report was initially expected, it was now assured there would be a majority report and at least one minority report.

The next concern of the termination phase was publication and dissemination of the report. Here what happened was rendered problematic by non-decision on the part of the government and the Commission over who was to make multiple copies of the report, and disseminate them. On November 9th, the Commission had eight typewritten copies of the Report, six for the commissioners and two for the government. No copies were provided for the press at this stage.[36] One commissioner loaned her copy to a journalist friend.[37] How the knowledge was to become public was problematic. There was a week interval before the first information for the public from the Report appeared in the press, though news of its completion was given at a press conference held by the Commission after presenting their Report to the government. During the press conference it was stated that when the Report would be made public was not known as this would be unlikely until after the Cabinet had an opportunity to study it.[38] What was not said was that multiple copies were simply unavailable. In reply to a reporter's question as to whether Senator Cameron thought the Commission's work was done, the reply was: "No, we'll have to sell these ideas for a long time."[39] This statement presaged continuing unofficial promotional activities on the part of the Commission.

A Commission-government crisis of small proportion added to the problematics since no provision was clearly made for larger-scale production of copies. It was first met by a limited edition of mimeographed copies arranged for by the Department of Education through the Queen's Printer—about one hundred copies. These were distributed within a matter of a few weeks to key persons in Alberta. This was followed on decision by government by a printed edition of several thousand which came out still later.[40] It was reported to the Legislature on April 7, 1960, that 1,123 copies had been sold, and 1,492 copies had been complementary.[41] Dissemination was delayed, and intermittent, largely as a consequence of Commission and government action and inaction. Further study is needed from other data to ascertain the "why's" of the problems of distribution of the Report.

The last aspect of the early part of the termination phase concerns the behaviour of Commission members and staff. After the

Commission turned in its report there was no further official interaction between the commissioners and the government. The commissioners had to learn what was happening from reading the newspapers.[42] The official control of the Commission's knowledge was now in the hands of the government. However, voluntary action of the commissioners in accepting speaking engagements for various associations and audiences after the report was submitted to government, unofficially prolonged their influence indirectly on government as they became promoters, defenders and opponents of majority and minority reports and recommendations.[43] A survey of newspaper reports of their speaking activities shows this aspect of termination lasted approximately into early 1961.[44] Similar speaking engagements extended the activities of Commission staff and researchers in the public professional arena of Alberta education.[45]

The Secretary of the Commission, Dr. Rees, continued his activities officially to complete the adminstrative loose ends of the Commission. However, his influence as an ex-Commission member was extended by his appointment by government to the ad hoc Special Departmental Committee on the Royal Commission, established to advise the government on the disposal of the Commission's recommendations. Dr. H. S. Baker, who was the Commission consultant on preparing the Report, was appointed by the University of Alberta as its representative on the Special Committee. The Committee worked for several months after the Commission was formally disbanded.[46]

It can be seen from the official and unofficial activities of Commission personnel, that the termination phase of the Commission extended into the promotional, prescriptive and other components of the government decision process in regard to education. The ways in which the Commission knowledge output was reinterpreted, legitimated and acted upon by the government are briefly considered at the conclusion of the chapter. However, before this, it is important to consider knowledge management within the Commission itself and the contribution of outside interests and groups to the knowledge and power of the Commission.

Power and Control in Knowledge Management within the Commission

The process of transformation of relatively heterogeneous knowledge input into relatively homogeneous knowledge output was the central knowledge management task of the six commissioners making up the Commission. It was expected that the Commission would gather, process and disseminate information and also make contributions to policy recommendations. In power outcome terms,[47] from the perspective of the government, this was the Commission's prime mandate, to produce "intelligence," which would contribute to the other power outcomes of government with respect to education. When the Commission itself is considered, it also had a decision process with power and knowledge outcomes expected, and in a truncated fashion would follow through the similar process components as Lasswell outlines for the "political order." Thus, internally the Commission would be concerned with acquiring knowledge, promoting internally that which it deemed most relevant, prescribing the knowledge it wanted officially to approve, invocating the knowledge it was dealing with in terms of the conformity or non-conformity to the knowledge it prescribed, applying the knowledge in terms of concrete recommendations, terminating claims put forward by those with competing knowledge and applications, and finally, appraising the outcomes of the aggregate flow of knowledge from these decision processes, and identifying those responsible for the successes or failures of the Commission's knowledge production.

Aspects of these processes have been examined in chapter four from a structural-functional perspective, where information-gathering, evaluation, consolidating and reporting were considered as separate activities. Before looking at the interaction within the Commission using the preceding knowledge-power paradigm, the various kinds of power exercised in the Commission need to be considered to help understand what Cartwright refers to as the link between social influence and individual motivation.[48] The Commission as a social system in its own right had legitimate power to pursue inquiry and create knowledge. This was the most obvious power held by the Commission. It was also granted coercive power, in its capacity to subpoena witnesses. Internally, there was coercive power delegated to the secretary, who kept attendance at meetings and issued payment to commissioners on the basis of attendance. This was linked with reward power, the monetary reimbursement of commissioners for their attendance. However, the Commission's reward power was more intense, as membership on the Commission could be regarded as a reward for the talents and qualities commissioners brought to their posts. Further, commissioners could reward others as a consequence of their official status and their unique and publicly significant backgrounds.

Reward power was also implicit in their ability as a group to influence one another through mutual approbation, and also to influence education and government, by their approval or disapproval of on-going practice and policy. Associated with reward power, especially as expressed internally in the Commission, is reference power, the power that the Commission had over its members and staff because of its attractiveness as a group, a Royal Commission, a group of leading Alberta citizens and educators. The final type of power identified by Cartwright is expert power, which is derived from professional training, or a concentrated practical experience with some specific activity. Part of the expert power of the Royal Commission was available in the persons of Commission members and staff, but part was latent in that the Commission could call experts as witnesses or expert services, which would augment the commissioners' intrinsic expert power.

While these types of power overlap to a degree, they provide useful conceptual tools for examining what went on within the Commission. In the interaction which occurred in the Commission, it is expected that these types of power would interact in different ways in the process components, thus contributing to the controls within the Commission on knowledge output, and at the same time, to the problematics of knowledge output. In this study, critical junctures in the ongoing interaction in the Commission are considered for what they reveal about management of knowledge within the Commission.

The process of conferring legitimate and enhancing reward power on the Commission began December 18, 1957, when the Commission members were unofficially called together by the government.[49] While as officially reported, this meeting was concerned with preparation of a public announcement and a call for briefs, it can be assumed that getting acquainted and morale-building were important at this stage. Thirty-nine meetings followed for which minutes were kept. These were supplemented by sub-committee meetings, collaboration as a group during hearings, and informal meetings of various kinds.[50]

One aspect of knowledge management within the Commission was the internal pressure of the commissioners who were not professional educators, to have wide public hearings, and in this, all the commissioners acquiesced.[51] During the interaction (that is, during the Commission's public hearings), the overshadowing phenomenon was Senator Cameron's genial chairmanship and his judicious use of reward power to those interacting with the Commission.[52] In the public hearings held in different parts of the province, the flow of knowledge was managed in outstanding fashion by the Commission with a large volume of public opinion and information being obtained.

The public hearing phase of the Commission, where the Commission's reward power was clearly in evidence as well as its coercive power (as debate was strictly controlled) can be interpreted partially at least, by reference to Lasswell's decision process. The public hearings can be seen as part of promotion in the decision process of the Commission. The Commission was itself adding agitational intensity to the province in an effort to elicit knowledge and opinion about educational issues. However, the Commission, successful in this endeavour as evidenced by the volume of submissions presented and the numbers of people who appeared before it, was faced with the problem of moving into the process of prescribing what, of all the knowledge received in the promotional phase, was to fit into the terms of reference, and of this knowledge, what was to be sanctioned positively and what negatively.

During the early life of the Commission, the expectations of the commissioners were apparently met. Their exercise of power was rewarding for themselves and for others. However, transition to prescription, invocation and the other processes caused strains and led to different styles of knowledge management. One evidence of this was commissioner Cormack's later criticism that what the people actually said did not get into the Commission's recommendations.[54] This statement, in the light of the foregoing discussion, suggests that transition from promotion to prescription in the Commission's total knowledge management process, was critical for knowledge outcomes and tended to make these outcomes problematic. This transition process is considered now in relation to the Commission's expert power.

The second aspect was the rise of expertise in the Commission as a force in knowledge management. This may be traced to the point when commissioner Mowat was elected as vice-chairman. From this time on, there was a concern with professional matters and the concrete problems of the education system apart from aims. One instance of this interaction aspect occurred with the hearing of the Separate Schools brief. Commissioner Cormack, whose turn it was in the rotation for leadership of the hearing, deferred to Dr. Mowat in order to avoid being identified in interest with this group.[55]

This was an example of management of knowledge, internal to the Commission. Other indications of the dominance of expertise in Commission interaction in the period extending to July of 1959 approximately,[56] were the accumulation of findings from formal research sponsored by the Commission and the submissions of consultants who appeared by invitation of the Commission at closed hearings.[57]

The interpretation of this phase of Commission interaction, was that the greater part of the life of the Commission was concerned with prescription—the official approval given to certain knowledge, but not to all. The aspects of invoking, application, termination were fused in the latter part as the Commission evolved its recommendations and eventually attempted to resolve its internal conflict over knowledge management by the preparation of both majority and minority reports. The final aspect in the decision process was appraisal. As has been indicated earlier in the chapter, there was limited time available for this activity to be carried out adequately.

The most striking aspect of knowledge management within the Commission was the explicit censure of the majority report by the minority report, and the reactions to this by the majority. In the eyes of one majority member, the majority failure to deal with philosophy of education was thoroughly justified, as the commissioners "had to grapple with many concrete problems."[58] But to this, Mr. Cormack as writer of the minority report answers:

> My colleagues have made many pertinent observations during the course of the hearings and have suggested remedies in those areas in which they feel that improvement or remedy is required. On the other hand, compelled by my conviction

> that the philosophy of education in Alberta is undergoing and has undergone a fundamental change, I have found it necessary to submit this minority report. For my part also I have in the course of the report suggested what I conceive to be efficient remedies.[59]

In their brief chapter "Divergent Opinion," the majority members of the Commission appraise the minority knowledge and policy position.[60] They see the essentialist-progressivist dialectic introduced by the minority report as an "oversimplification," 'a convenient logic for discrediting opinion and practice' with which the minority commissioner could not agree. His conclusions, therefore, were "unwarranted." The majority rejected the minority implication of "rampant progressivism," and asserted its own interest in 'protecting society' from the "authoritarian zeal of a particular philosophy or philosophies." They rejected "the innuendo" that Alberta schools "have driven a wedge between parent and child," and found it difficult to appreciate just how parental rights would flourish under educational domination of "right wing members of the essentialist philosophy." They foresaw the minority recommendation leading to "educational chaos" and to "the ruins of the public school system," which "would be susceptible to rebuilding by other numerous authoritative forces who would construct denominational systems." To this the majority commissioners were "unalterably opposed." Their appraisal of the minority report was concluded by reference to the absence of the minority commissioner from "meetings where many majority decisions were reached," a factor they associated with the misunderstanding and misinterpretation of their sections dealing with community colleges, the Educational Planning Commission, vocational education and accreditation.

This internal appraisal of the minority by the majority and vice versa, not only reflected divergent approaches to educational knowledge by each but also indicated the culmination of the knowledge management and production processes within the Commission. The culmination was a debate, which, as previously indicated, carried on as part of the promotion component of the government's decision-making power in education. As the chairman remarked earlier, "the work of the Commission had to be sold."

Knowledge Management in Relation to Interests and Groups Outside the Commission

In this section consideration is given to interests and groups outside the Commission, in relation to the knowledge management processes by the Commission, and also, to a limited extent depending on the data available, the knowledge management occurring in groups outside the Commission. With respect to the Commission itself, it is possible to think of input, what went into the Commission from the outside, and output, the knowledge the Commission produced in its final report. However, what was problematic in the input to the Commission, and was thus potentially problematic in its output, consisted initially of what was problematic in the inputs themselves: (1) decisions of individuals and groups to make a presentation, or to make only a written submission; (2) the process of knowledge management within outside groups who prepared and presented briefs; (3) the ways the individuals and groups actually presented their briefs, especially during the public hearings when under cross-examination;

(4) the reaction of the Commission to the briefs and their presentation. There is concern here for this aspect of knowledge management, even though the data for a full analysis were often lacking. In what follows, the focus is on groups more than interests, in relation to the Royal Commission. The latter term, interests, has reference to the wider publics which were represented by groups actually making presentations or submissions to the Commission.

The formal beginning of outside group and interested-individual input occurred when the Commission's announcement appeared on 11 January, 1958 in the provincial press. The announcement called for briefs, stated the ways briefs should be written, the number of copies needed (ten), and gave the schedule for public hearings in various parts of the province.[61] The calling for briefs was not problematic, but the number and quality of briefs that might be received was problematic. The schedule of places where briefs were to be heard and supported was an attempt at managing input ecologically by facilitating presentation of briefs by those not living in the two major cities. One example comprised the agendas prepared in advance by the secretary, with instructions to those appearing telling what was expected, exact time, place and duration of the presentation, notice of how many could speak, and specification that the content of briefs was to be explained and described, not to be re-read. Mention was also made that there would be no cross-examination by the public of persons to be examined by the Commission.[62] These norms were designed by the Commission to help manage knowledge inputs. Their manifest function was to reduce chances of disturbance, distraction and verboseness during Commission hearings and to assure Commission control. By letting it be known that commissioners would have read all briefs prior to the hearing, they could justify their role as the only cross-examiners.

There is no ready way of classifying all the individuals who spoke to the commissioners in public hearings or in the informal situations associated with Commission travel during the period of the hearings. It is recalled from chapter four, that thirty individual briefs were presented.[63] From analysis of these, it was determined that twenty briefs were submitted from teachers or ex-teachers.[64] Most of these persons did not appear as witnesses. It can be safely concluded then, that the large proportion, two thirds, of formal individual inputs were from persons closely associated with teaching at the same time.

Group inputs were more numerous. (See Appendix DII.7 for numbered briefs.) There were altogether one hundred and fifty-nine, ranging from relatively short ones such as the one submitted by Wild-Life Tours (#70) asking that schools emphasize conservation, to the two-volume briefs of the Faculty of Education (#66) and of the Alberta Teachers' Association (#11) which dealt extensively with all the terms of reference of the Commission. Some grasp of the volume and range of inputs can be seen from Table 6, based on Caldwell's functional categorization of one hundred and forty-seven of the one hundred and fifty-nine Cameron Commission group briefs.

As indicated in this table, the most frequent inputs were

TABLE 6

GROUP BRIEFS TO COMMISSION CLASSIFIED BY INTEREST GROUP

Functional Category			Numbers of Briefs
Bilingual Communication			3
Knowledge	Total		9
Professional Association		7	
Library Association		2	
Maintenance	Total		33
Family Organization		1	
Business Group		12	
Agricultural Group		9	
Welfare and Health		7	
Service		3	
Labor Organization		1	
Social Organization	Total		7
Political Party		1	
Government Institution		1	
Ethnic Group		5	
Socialization	Total		80
Student Group		2	
Teacher Association		12	
Public School Administrator		14	
Catholic School Administrator		3	
University Faculties of Edmonton		2	
University Faculties, non-Edmonton		7	
University Women		4	
Home and School Association		27	
Catholic Alumnae		2	
Special Interests		7	
Expression	Total		15
Catholic Church		2	
Protestant Church		7	
Cultural		4	
Leisure		2	
			147

SOURCE: G. Caldwell, "Educational Values in Alberta—A Study of the Orientations of the Department of Education and Interest Groups" (M.A. thesis, University of Calgary, 1968). Appendix B.

from groups concerned with socialization, which could be reinterpreted without loss of accuracy, as education. Other societal sectors were numerically much smaller in their representations, and a number of their submissions were quite limited in scope of concern, as for example, the Institute of Public Accountants who simply wished the Commission to make sure they received parity of recognition in schools and university with the Institute of Chartered Accountants.

The Commission reaction to the briefs varied from polite acknowledgement, to wholehearted praise, to critical reservation, to prolonged and heated debate. Individual briefs were dealt with usually by polite acknowledgement by letter. Three briefs were received with critical reservation. The brief from the Institute of Public Accountants was rated by the Commission as "amongst the least helpful." The Women's Christian Temperance Union had their case diminished by commissioner questioning which recalled the Hotelmen's scholarships of Alberta for worthy students, a line of questioning pursued by a commissioner who was also a member of the Hotelmen's scholarship board.[65] Here was an instance of an outside reference group apparently affecting the management of input into the Commission. Three groups wanted evolution taught as unsubstantiated theory. In their questioning, the commissioners led by a professional educator tried to get those presenting the briefs to admit that, even if it was a theory, it should be allowed alongside other theories, such as those of religion. Couldn't evolution be accepted on faith? This was an attempt to manage knowledge, so that knowledge from science had an equal status with knowledge from religion.

The Commission generally rewarded with verbal praise submissions by Home and School Associations, by professional groups, except for the instance in the preceding paragraph, and by the Commonwealth Co-operative Federation, which urged that schools teach more about co-operatives. However, the strongest praise went to the Alberta Teachers' Association, for its thoroughness, detail, and relevance to the Commission's terms of reference. The Alberta Teachers' Association was, however, criticized for its short shrift of the aims of education, a criticism prompting the Association to reply with a three-page "hand-out" supporting further, its call for a representative body in Alberta to advise the Minister on educational aims.[66] The Commission's respect for the Alberta Teachers' Association command of relevant knowledge was shown when the Association was asked to present in September, a supplementary brief dealing with the difficult questions of teacher merit pay and tenure.[67]

The Commission also was impressed, but not so obviously, with the briefs from the Faculties of Education of the University of Alberta. One reason for the ascendance of the Alberta Teachers' Association brief over all others, including faculty briefs, was the way the Alberta Teachers' Association obtained and managed the knowledge it submitted. The Association called upon the Faculty of Education in Edmonton to write chapters from their areas of expertise, and asked these authors to be the "panel of experts" present when the brief was submitted.[68] A corollary of this knowledge management was the decision of the Faculty of Education to present only a very modest brief describing its own work. When this brief appeared and came to the attention of the University President, he immediately asked the Dean of Education to submit a second brief dealing specifically with matters in the terms of reference of the Commission.[69] In the Alberta Teachers' Association and Faculty of Education instances, there was thus a deliberate effort to manage the knowledge input, in the first case, an effort apparently motivated by the anticipated reward power of the Commission, and the second, an effort attributable to the University desire to be of greater public service and also to be known for the quality and breadth of its scholarship.

Perhaps the most important outside group input to the Commission was that from Catholic groups. Because of its importance, this will be dealt with in a chronological fashion.

The first evidence to note was the presence of Father Kindervater, the Executive Director of the Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association and Dr. G. Cormack the brother of commissioner Cormack at each session of the first set of public hearings in Edmonton. The hearings were held in April and early May, 1958. In the interaction which took place during the open hearings, there was always the visible reminder that the Catholic segment of Alberta's population was represented in the audience. The presence of Dr. Cormack indicated the operation of another reference group in relation to commissioner Cormack, that of the family-Church reference group. It is also known that there was frequent informal discussion and dialogue between these people concerning the events of the hearings.[70] However, the formal presentations from Catholic groups which began in September, 1958 provided evidence of knowledge management in the preparation of briefs. This evidence was found in the nature of the recommendations from the Catholic briefs. While there was variation among the submitting groups (Edmonton Separate School Board, Alberta Catholic Trustees'

Association, Catholic Conference of Alberta, St. Louis Roman Catholic Separate School Division #21, St. Paul District #2228),[71] there were issues common to all their briefs (Catholic teacher training preferably in Catholic institutions, Catholic textbooks and freedom to place religion at any time in the school timetable, not only in the last half hour of the school day),[72] There was another issue which was prominent for the large Catholic groups, that of the disabilities suffered because of the large unit of administration.[73]

The charges levelled against teacher education, the School Acts, school system administration, to be found especially in the Catholic Conference brief, were far-reaching in their implications. Further evidence of knowledge management is found in the Trustees' description of the procedure adopted to achieve representativeness in the content of their brief:

> All Catholic school boards, Catholic organizations interested in education, Catholic educators and other prominent Catholic professional people were asked to study the terms of reference . . . and to bring to our attention problems they felt should be dealt with by this Brief . . . this Brief is to be sent to every Catholic school board of the province for their approval.[74]

Reaction within the Commission at the hearings can only be gauged from the limited data remaining, as transcripts for all the sessions at which the Catholic briefs were heard were not available. However, the transcripts for the hearings of the Catholic Trustees' and St. Paul District Briefs have been preserved and some trends in questioning can be detected. The questions from majority commissioners emphasized as a superordinate goal the nature and benefits of public education in the province and the need for both systems to conform to its regulations. The questioning seemed to attempt to elicit information of this from those being cross-examined. This was seen in the

Trustees' hearing in which the grievances of the separate schools due to effects of the large unit of administration were aired. On the other hand, the questioning of the minority commissioner enabled the respondents to emphasize the main recommendations of their briefs. For example, in the St. Paul School District hearing, Mr. Cormack asked a number of questions which enabled the witnesses to reiterate their desire for more flexibility in the time-tabling of religion.[75]

A decisive reaction to the hearing of the Catholic briefs was the calling of consultants to closed session of the Commission to inform the Commission of the legal aspects of the Separate School situation. This action could be interpreted as managing of knowledge in terms of the repeated insistence of the majority commissioners to stay within the normative rather than the value framework. The expert witnesses were the Deputy Minister of Education and the Deputy Attorney General. These witnesses gave evidence in December, 1958.[76] There was a counter-reaction in the call by Mr. Cormack for further consultants, from the Catholic educational system, in connection with the Catholic viewpoint on education. This incident occurred in the twenty-ninth meeting of the Commission on 28 April, 1958.[77] Mr. Cormack was asked to arrange for suitable witnesses. Father Kindervater and Mr. Van Tighem of the Catholic School Trustees' Association were invited. They met with the Commission in May, 1959.[78]

The developments in relation to the Separate Schools were beginning to introduce some problematic aspects into the work of the Commission and the kind of knowledge it would eventually produce. The interaction in the Commission now began to focus on new ways of managing knowledge to deal with an unexpected, but now forseeable outcome, the production of a minority report.

The first evidence of this shift in knowledge management occurred in the June, 1959 meetings of the Commission in Calgary: this was followed by further action in the July meetings in Banff.[79] The closing off procedures of the Commission were drafted, close to the agenda which was agreed upon for terminating the Royal Commission, which was referred to earlier in the chapter. The interaction which took place in the Commission from July to October is not known, as there were no regular meetings of the Commission. The next evidence of the impact of the Catholic groups through Mr. Cormack on the Commission was his strong appeal to the Commission on 30 September 1959 for a thorough review of the whole philosophy of education and that the Commission's report should set out a definite philosophy for education in Alberta. In addition, he contended that the Commission should expose the weaknesses of the education system to parents and that parents and the Church should have more say in education. He disapproved of the "whole philosophy of education" which had developed around the Enterprise. He urged that the aims of education be clearly stated in the Report. He strongly criticized the suggested personnel for the Alberta Educational Planning Commission and the system of guidance. In both of these cases, Mr. Cormack denigrated the activities of professional educators and suggested instead the use of the clergy.[80] The majority commissioners failed to respond to this appeal, and in a subsequent letter dated October 21, 1959, Mr. Cormack officially announced his intention to present a minority report and to withdraw from participation in the majority report.[81]

This chronological account of the Catholic group input into the Royal Commission gives insight into the knowledge management within the groups as they prepared and presented briefs and maintained a watching brief at public hearings. This account also gives further insight into the nature of knowledge management within the Commission and the processes through which the minority report came to be written. The conflict between majority and minority positions led to two paths of knowledge management, one incorporated into the majority report which dealt with Alberta's educational problems without considering explicitly the value context for dealing with them. On the other hand, the minority position made value considerations the prime problem, from which all else could be resolved. However, much of the internal interaction in the Royal Commission, especially in its later phases, can be described not so much as knowledge management but as the management of criteria for dealing with problems with the ontic status of values or educational aims. In this sense, the internal problem of the Commission was value management from which its knowledge management was derived.

There was one last group input into the Alberta Royal Commission that must be considered. The Alberta commissioners met twice with the commissioners from the British Columbia and Manitoba Royal Commissions on Education at Banff, March 2-5,1959 and July 2-3, 1959.[82] Here the reward power of the Alberta Commission in being able to use the facilities of the Banff School of Fine Arts was apparent. At no time did the Alberta Commission go as a group outside the province to confer with the other Commissions. While no minutes were kept, the agendas of the meetings show the concerns of all Commissions with certain common problems. The first meeting dealt with provision for individual differences, recognition of teacher excellence, salary scales for educational workers, teacher education and qualifications, and long term educational planning. The second meeting considered nine additional problems. These were curriculum, technological training, accreditation of schools, coordination of educational services, scholarships, adult education, articulation with the universities, the role of radio and television in education, and the county system.[83]

It is difficult to say precisely what these meetings contributed to knowledge management in the Alberta Royal Commission. It can be inferred, however, from the similarities in style and content of the three Royal Commission Reports,[84] excluding the Alberta minority report, that there was a consensus about what knowledge was appropriate. It can also be inferred that these meetings had a legitimating function for the work and knowledge production of each Commission, in addition to augmenting their reward and reference power.

Summary and Conclusions

In this chapter the data from chapters three and four, along with data from other primary and secondary sources, have been re-examined and re-interpreted from an augmented sociology of knowledge perspective. The main concerns have shifted to knowledge management as a central focus of the Commission, and to the power and control dimensions in the temporary undertaking by the Commission of society's role in selecting, classifying, distributing, transmitting and evaluation of public educational knowledge.

The interpretative analysis focussed,in the first place, on the Commission in relation to the policy context of the Alberta government. It was shown that, contrary to what might have been predicted as a result of accepting the institutionalized model of a royal commission, there was government influence on the Commission's knowledge management process at each phase of its existence—official creation, organizational, operational and termination.

The second focus was on power and control in knowledge management within the Commission itself. The interactions of Commission members and staff were examined using Lasswell's paradigm of power outcomes in relation to the decision process and Cartwright's typology of power. It was found that knowledge produced within the Commission was influenced by the differentiated development and use of power during the different phases of the Commission's work. During the beginning phase of the Commission when public hearings were held, the power of the non-educational members of the Commission appeared ascendant. During the research and study phase, the expert power of the professional educator became the dominant internal force. Near and at the conclusion of the Commission's work, power was divided between the majority commissioners and the commissioner who had taken on a minority role. The knowledge management at each phase reflected the dominant expression of power.

3

The relationship between the Commission and outside groups, other than the government in the management of knowledge, was the third focus. Here it was seen that, while the largest volume and most highly praised knowledge submitted to the Commission came from professional educators and their associations, the input that most affected knowledge management came from the Catholic briefs. This input culminated in the production of two reports, one from the majority of the commissioners dealing with the assigned terms of reference in specific ways, and the other, a minority report which was most concerned with the basic aims of education.

In each of the foregoing analyses, it was observed that the production of knowledge process was influenced by factors which made the final outcome, the Report, problematic right to the time it was submitted and made available for distribution. As the management of knowledge process was followed through each phase of the Commission's duration, it also became apparent that the Commission acquired a management task which in some respects became even more critical than the managing of knowledge. This was the management of values upon which knowledge depended for its origin and legitimation.

Footnotes

[1] B. Bernstein, "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge," in Knowledge and Control, ed. M. F. D. Young (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), p. 47.

[2] M. F. D. Young, "On the Politics of Educational Knowledge," Economy and Society 1 (1972): 194. The article recognized the political character of education and definitions of educational knowledge, illustrating the orientation of examining the Schools Council as a case-study.

[3] Ibid. Young derived this term from the sociological writing of C. W. Mills who expressed the concept in these terms:

> "Motives may be considered as typical vocabularies having ascertainable functions in delimited social situations. Motives are terms in which interpretation of conduct of social actors proceeds. The imputation and avowal of motives to actors are social phenomena to be explained . . . Motives must be situated . . . The languages of situations as given must be interpreted and related to their conditions."

The explanation is taken from Mills' article, "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive," American Sociological Review 5 (1940): 904-913.

[4] H. Lasswell, A Pre-View of Policy Sciences (New York: American Elsevier, 1971), pp. 28-31.

[5] C. Loomis, Social Systems (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1960), p. 8.

[6] Note that there is a wide range of meanings used for control. One example is cited in the Glossary of Terms in chapter one. Here the term is being used in the sense of the right to initiate action and to take decisions relative to the allocation of the resources of a social system. Ultimately we are concerned in power with who controls the available energy. This is the Loomis interpretation of control, the reference for which is given in Footnote 5.

[7] H. Vaughan, and M. S. Archer, Social Conflict and Educational Change in England and France 1789-1848 (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), p. 21.

[8] P. J. Daine, "Educational Knowledge Codes: An Analysis of the Bernstein Typology" (M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1974), p. 11.

[9] A detailed discussion of the problems of order and control is to be found in A. Dawe, "The Two Sociologies," British Journal of Sociology 21 (1970): 207-218.

[10] This interpretation is based on Blum's hypothesis that "[Marx's] polemic charged that every term must be conceived as an instance of social action and related to the typical mind of a typical actor," found in A. Blum, "The Corpus of Knowledge as a Normative Order: Intellectual Critiques of the Social Order of Knowledge and Commonsense Features of Bodies of Knowledge," in Knowledge and Control, ed. M. F. D. Young, op. cit., p. 124.

[11] Definition to be found in Young's introduction to his book, Knowledge and Control, op. cit., p. 3.

[12] Order-in-Council 2009/57 December 31, 1957.

[13] Order-in-Council 1403/57 September 9, 1957.

[14] Report of the Royal Commission on Education (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1959), p. 3.

[15] Ibid., p. 6.

[16] Ibid., p. 4.

[17] See biographical profile of Senator Cameron, Appendix C.

[18] From interview with Senator Cameron, 31 July, 1974.

[19] J. Andrews, "Public and Professional Opinion Regarding the Tasks of the Public Schools of Alberta," in Report of the Royal Commission on Education, op. cit., Appendix C, pp. 325-330. One indication of this emphasis in hearings was found in Senator Cameron's introduction to the hearing of the AFHSA brief, Monday April 21, 1958 in Edmonton, in which he said "We will want to know what they (the public) are thinking, particularly what people's concepts are of the aims and objectives of education . . . We will probably be asking you specifically what your aims are." Found in Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

[20] The Minority report dealt with this question by giving an extended comparison between the Progressivist and Essentialist philosophies of education. The bias for the Essentialist definition of education was explicit. Report of the Royal Commission on Education, op. cit., p. 376.

[21] Minutes of the first meeting of the Advisory Committee, September 9, 1959. From the President's Files, 1956-1961, University of Alberta Archives.

[22] Minutes of the 36th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission, 4 July 1959. Mrs. Taylor did not proceed in this matter.

[23] From interview with Dr. Rees, 30 May 1974.

[24] From interview with Dr. MacArthur, 25 June 1974.

[25] Listed in Appendix DI.5.

[26] See *Report of the Royal Commission on Education*, op. cit., p. xx.

[27] Ibid., Appendix C.

[28] Telephone conversation with Dr. G. Mowat, 1 November 1974. Taken by Dr. B. Y. Card.

[29] From interview with Mr. Aalborg, 27 May 1974; and Senator Cameron, 31 July 1974.

[30] Minutes of the 11th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission, 10-12 November 1958. Item 158 - a letter from the Minister of Education that the research fund was to be held at $7,500. The Director of research reported that no further extensive research would be undertaken.

[31] See interviews with Mrs. Hansen, 6 June 1974, and Dr. Mowat, 16 June 1974.

[32] From interview with Senator Cameron, 31 July 1974.

[33] *Report of the Commission on Educational Planning* (Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1972), Appendix a, p. 304.

[34] Minutes of the 37th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 1 October 1959.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Telephone conversation with Dr. W. Swift, 2 November 1974.

[37] Interview with Mrs. Hansen, 6 June 1974.

[38] Newsitem "Educational Report Turned In," in The *Edmonton Journal*, 9 November 1959, p. 26.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Telephone conversation with Dr. W. Swift, 2 November 1974.

[41] News item "Educational Study Cost $123,663," in The *Edmonton Journal*, 7 April 1960, p. 122.

[42] Interview with Mr. Cormack, 24 May 1974.

[43] See Footnotes 61,62, chapter four.

[44] For example, Mr. Cormack spoke at the meeting of the McDougall Home and School Association on Accreditation, reported in The Edmonton Journal, 9 March 1961, p. 5; and Dr. Mowat commented on financing of education, reported in The Edmonton Journal, 17 March 1961, p. 46.

[45] For example, speech by Dr. J. Andrews to ATA Convention, reported in The Edmonton Journal, 20 October 1960, p. 30.

[46] The membership of the Special Departmental Committee on the Royal Commission included Messrs. Berry, Evenson, Rees, Purvis, Aldridge, Watts, Conquest, Byrne, Swift, Smith, Baker. List in Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

[47] H. Lasswell, op. cit., pp. 28-31. The seven components of the decision process in policy-making have been described in chapter two.

[48] D. Cartwright, "Influence, Leadership, Control," in Handbook of Organizations, ed. J. G. March (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965), p. 31.

[49] First meeting recorded in Commission Minutes, December 18, 1957. Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

[50] See Appendix DI.1 for Index of Commission Minutes.

[51] From interview with Dr. Mowat, 17 June 1974.

[52] Senator Cameron's informal style of introducing a Commission hearing was noted in the case of the AFHSA hearing, 21 April 1958. Mrs. Hansen commented on Senator Cameron's flair in conducting the hearings, Interview 6 June 1974 and Dr. B. Y. Card, who assisted in the hearings for the presentation of the ATA and Faculty of Education Briefs, attested to Senator Cameron's ability to promote a good atmosphere and to verbally reward those who were contributing.

[53] Chapter four discussed the informational input to the Commission from briefs and other submissions, and public hearings.

[54] Volunteered in interview with Mr. Cormack, 24 June 1974.

[55] See transcript of hearing for Edmonton Separate School Board, no date. Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

[56] The nature of Commission activity can be gauged to some extent by a perusal of the Index of Minutes in Appendix DI.1.

[57] The titles of research reports and material on submissions by consultants have been included in Appendix DI.5, and Appendix DI.3 respectively.

[58] See interview with Mrs. Taylor, 28 May 1974.

[59] Minority report in Report of the Royal Commission on Education, op. cit., p. 450.

[60] Report of the Royal Commission on Education, op. cit., pp. 288-289. This section contains all the subsequent quoted material therefore separate footnotes have not been included.

[61] For example, to be found in the Edmonton Journal, 11 January 1958, p. 6.

[62] One example of these instructions was to be found in a letter from the Secretary of Mr. W. Murray, undated. Commission Files, Department of Education.

[63] Information contained in Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

[64] By systematic analysis is meant the reading of all the briefs and transcripts of hearings extant, looking for key features such as main aspects of the content of the brief, reaction of the Commission, classification of brief by source. In addition, the research carried out by Caldwell, in his master's thesis referred to in this chapter, has been utilized in that his functional categories for group briefs have been used as a basis for further analysis. The following comments on briefs, unless specified otherwise, have been obtained by the combination of the two methods described above and will not be subject to further footnoting.

[65] See biographical profiles, Appendix C, Mrs. Hansen.

[66] This "hand-out" was made available by Dr. B. Y. Card.

[67] The Alberta Teachers' Association, Supplementary Brief to Alberta Royal Commission on Education, September 1958. Made available by Dr. B. Y. Card.

[68] Dr. S. C. T. Clarke indicated the steps in this procedure, in interview, 13 June 1974.

[69] Letters from Dean Johns to Dr. Stewart, April 1958; from Dr. Stewart to Dean Coutts, 5 April 1958; from Dean Coutts to Dr. Stewart, 12 April 1958 indicated respectively, dissatisfaction with the Faculty of Education brief, the request that a further part be added, and the reply and acquiescence of the Dean of the Faculty of Education. Found in President's Files, 1956-1961, University of Alberta Archives.

[70] Information obtained in personal interview with Mr. J. Cormack, 24 May 1974 and in telephone conversation with Dr. G. Cormack, 5 November 1974. Also reference was made to the influence of the Commission on Dr. G. Cormack's thinking on education in Daine's thesis, op. cit., p. 42.

[71] The briefs numbered 35, 2, 25, 134, 147 respectively, are listed in Appendix DII.7.

[72] See Summary of Briefs and Hearings, prepared by the Assistant Secretary of the Commission. Pamphlet file, Education Library, University of Alberta.

[73] Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Brief, p. 12.

[74] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[75] Both transcripts were available in Commission Files, Department of Education Archives, but only the one for the St. Paul Brief was available in the pamphlet file of the Faculty of Education Library.

[76] Minutes of the 16th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 16-18 December 1958.

[77] Minutes of the 29th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 28-30 April 1959.

[78] Minutes of the 31st Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 25-29 May 1959.

[79] Minutes of the 35th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 15-19 June 1959 and 36th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 4 July 1959.

[80] Minutes of the 37th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 30 September-1 October 1959.

[81] Minutes of the 38th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 23-28 October 1959.

[82] These meetings were reported in the Alberta press, for example, *The Albertan*, 27 February 1958, p. 5; and in the *Report of the Royal Commission on Education*, op. cit., p. 9.

[83] From Agenda of the 24th Regular Meeting of the Royal Commission on Education, 2-5 March 1959 and from Agenda of the Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia Meeting, 2-3 July 1959.

[84] The main features are to be found in Appendix A1 of the present study.

CHAPTER VI

EXPLAINING THE CAMERON COMMISSION: THE QUEST FOR MEANING

Introduction

In chapters three, four and five, an attempt has been made to examine empirically the emergence of the Royal Commission, its structure and function in Alberta society and its attempts at the management of knowledge. These chapters have been descriptive and analytical to a degree. The purpose of the present chapter is to go beyond the facts and conclusions generated in these chapters in an effort to find further understanding and more plausible explanations for all the behaviour of, and all the knowledge produced by, the Royal Commission.

To achieve the above aim the chapter is divided into two parts. The first is a re-examination of the emergence, organization and function, and knowledge control and management data to contrast and compare the meaning derived from the phenomenological, structural-functional, and sociology of knowledge approaches that have been used. The second part of the chapter is a re-examination of selected aspects of sociological theory to see what further insight into the Royal Commission they yield and also to explore some possible contributions of this particular case study to a critical assessment of the theory under review.

A Re-Examination of Chapters Three to Five in a Quest for Meaning

In the phenomenological approach, the actors do the talking. There is a stress on the everyday language and existing frames of reference of the actors. The procedure adopted here is to repeat in a somewhat condensed fashion, the views expressed by commissioners and others closely associated with the Commission, to learn their explanations. After these nearly verbatim comments are given, the findings from historical and sociological description and analysis are then examined and the meanings they give about the Royal Commission are compared with the phenomenological interpretations.

Emergence

First considered is the historical emergence of the Royal Commission. The question to which phenomenological responses were directed was: "Why was there a Royal Commission in 1957?". Each interviewee was given an opportunity to review the answers given by him or her to this question and has assented to their reproduction where needed in this study.[1]

Question: Why was there a Royal Commission in 1957?

Speaker	Comment
Senator Cameron Chairman	Education has been a continuing problem; over time many groups in the province had tried to find solutions. One particular problem was dissatisfaction over child-centred education. Another factor was the presence of a strong Faculty of Education.
Mr. Cormack Commissioner	Two factors were prominent—alienation of parents and excessive peer group pressure on children. These had resulted from centralization, specialization and increasing

	complexity in the education system and progressive methods and poor teacher training.
Mrs. Hansen Commissioner	There was dissatisfaction with progressive education because of lack of teacher training. There had been a population explosion and a change in attitudes towards education above the minimum standard. Thus a larger, more heterogeneous population was to be found in schools, with fears of inadequate grade XII standards.
Dr. Mowat Commissioner	The Commission was seen as a control measure to counter a massive and prolonged attack on public education.
Mrs. Taylor Commissioner	There had been a large volume of criticism of public education. The project method was especially unpopular. The teacher shortage was severe in rural areas.
Dr. Rees Commission Secretary	People were questioning the way education was being given and wanted more stress on subject matter. The effect of the Sputnik achievement enhanced the call for more academic rigour.
Dr. Swift Deputy Minister	There was an ambivalence among all the groups in the province—some urging democratization of education and others academic rigour. Other problems were the teacher shortage and the drop-out phenomenon. The idea of the Commission developed within the government.
Senator Manning Premier	The idea of the Commission stemmed from the major organizations in the province. It was the government's philosophy to maintain a close liason with the public and to anticipate problems and needs ahead of time. The Commission was a natural outgrowth of these features.
Mr. Aalborg Minister of Education	The government needed guide-lines for future policy and knowledge to solve problems such as teacher training, teacher supply, school buildings, transportation. Many groups were urging an inquiry into education but teachers were more aggressive in seeking a study and gave the lead to other groups.

Dr. Clarke Executive Secretary Alberta Teachers' Association	The Commission was hurriedly set up by the government which prevented input from organized groups. Important influences were ferment in United States education which had diffused into Alberta and critical writings on education e.g. Neatby and the press.
Dr. Coutts Dean of Faculty of Education	The Royal Commission acted as a buffer to 'take the heat off' the government. Features contributing to the critical climate over education were: dispersion of views of Neatby, pressure by Trustees' for increased provincial funding, the (unfavourable) changes in matriculation requirements, the precedent of Ontario's Hope Commission, the leadership of the Faculty of Education in encouraging child-centred education.

Some common themes in these comments were the teacher shortage, dissatisfaction over progressive education, and critical writings on education. However, there were differences such as opinion on the source of the pressure to hold a commission, problems of educational funding and the alleged alienation of parents. The critical difference was whether the Commission emerged because of the dissatisfaction of the people or because the government needed to exercise social control. Thus, these phenomenological data indicated that the establishment of the Commission itself tended to be problematic, and once established there would be the possibility of problematic outcomes. It is also observed that there is a high level of congruence between these comments and the historical factors examined in chapter three from which reasons were suggested to explain why the Commission was called.

The historical survey in chapter three contributed an account of the flow of events and happenings, not recalled by the interviewees and this is one of the advantages of the historical approach. However, there is a danger in that the historical flow did not point out the problematic origin of the Royal Commission. Yet this came out in the phenomenological explanations of "why." As demonstrated at the end of chapter three, a frame of reference which took into account the problematic aspects of the Commission's emergence was that derived from collective behaviour theory. This subsumed sub-stratum features, strains and the development of generalized beliefs. It also considered precipitating factors, organization for reform and the counter measures of the forces of social control, with each contributing in a value-added way to the emergence of the Royal Commission and not to some other attempt to deal with the problems of education at that time.

The collective behaviour approach conceived of all these determinants operating and eventuating in a norm-oriented movement. The Royal Commission was to put the norm-oriented movement into an institutionalized setting for two years. The task of preparing better rules could be delegated to this particular body. The collective behaviour approach has been useful because it showed that the emergence of the Royal Commission was problematic. On re-examination, it appears to have utility for the scholar in that it includes both phenomenological and historical data in accounting for the emergence of the Royal Commission.

Organization and Function

The second aspect to be considered is that of organization and function of the Commission. A number of questions were asked on these aspects of the Commission. For the purpose of this chapter, responses were selected which related most closely to perceptions of the organization and functioning of the Commission as it attempted to achieve the official purposes for which it was created. The questions asked did not concern the implementation of recommendations or the termination phase of the Commission.

The phenomenological-type data below include comment from the Commission members and from the Commission secretary and the deputy minister in office during 1957 to 1959. These were the persons most directly concerned with the Commission's organization and functioning. Once the Commission was established the government officially had no more to do with it until the report was submitted.

Theme Question: How was the Commission organized and how did it function to achieve its official purposes? (See Appendix E for actual questions asked in interviews.)

Speaker	Comment
Senator Cameron Chairman	The Royal Commission can be conceived as the democratic process in action. There was a lack in the omission of continuing education from the terms of reference. The Commission wanted to get the views of the people by means of hearings. Objectivity was ensured by research. The Catholic viewpoint was opposed to the general view leading to a clash of ideologies—with a strong Catholic lobby. The Commission tried to reconcile both views.
Mr. Cormack Commissioner	Public opinion was tapped but much of it was disregarded—trends seemed to have been decided in advance. Various people were given sections of the report to write and it was not clear how they reached their conclusions—whether they had drawn on the briefs or not.
Mrs. Hansen Commissioner	The membership should have been broadened to include a practising teacher. The Commission's main task was a total analysis of the existing curriculum.

Dr. Mowat Commissioner	The Commission felt that the government was not pulling a political game on them and they felt they could do something for education. The Royal Commission had high visibility and so gave the people a real opportunity to speak about educational concerns. Lay members were keen to find out what people thought and to hear witnesses qualified to speak on particular issues.
Mrs. Taylor Commissioner	The Commission should have considered educational finance as recommendations for change had to be devised. The public hearings were promoted through the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations, Farmers' Union of Alberta and Farm Women's Union of Alberta. There could have been people who felt they lacked the ability to voice their opinion and so did not come forward at all.
Dr. Rees Commission Secretary	The Commission members felt keenly that they could not consider educational finance. Procedures for gaining public and expert opinion were needed.
Dr. Swift Deputy Minister	The Minister was surprised when large sums of money were required for formal research to gain expert information. Dr. Swift was disappointed that officers of the Department were not called on more by the Commission. Commission had to find out what people were thinking.

The above phenomenological responses suggest that information-gathering and policy-making were considered the main functions of the Commission along with tapping public opinion. The mechanisms for obtaining public opinion and information were the use of briefs and of open hearings. There was also an acceptance of the need for research to obtain "objective" knowledge as opposed to "subjective" folk knowledge. There were indications of resentment towards governmental control over aspects of the Commission's organization and function; for example, membership and omission of educational finance from the information and policy function. Comments made by the chairman on the function of the Commission to encompass the differing ideologies in the province and within the Commission on education gave some indication of the idealistic conception of the Commission which is discussed in part two of the chapter.

The systematic structural-functional examination of the Royal Commission attempted in chapter four shows a great deal of congruence with the above phenomenological statements, especially with regard to the Commission's manifest functions. However, the phenomenological data did not show the dominance in the internal operation of the Commission of the professional educator in much of the decision-making that affected the recommendations put forward by the majority commissioners and the relationship of this phenomenon to the internal conflict leading to the minority report.

The structural-functional analysis made explicit the dominant power relationships reflected in the Commission's recommendations which assumed or took for granted structural-functional linkages with such groups as the Faculty of Education and the Alberta Teachers' Association. These linkages, the necessity for them, and their functionality for Alberta society were shown to be the basis for the minority challenge to the majority in the Commission. The structural-functional analysis, while going beyond the phenomenological data collected during interviewing for this study, added further insight into the Royal Commission as the problematic though institutionalized resultant of a norm-oriented movement which had an official life-span of two years'duration.

Knowledge Management and Control

The third area to be re-examined is that of knowledge management and control. The comments below were abstracted from the questions on recommendations and reporting shown in Appendix E. Only comments by commissioners are considered here, as only they were officially responsible for the control and management of knowledge by the Commission.

Theme Question: How did the Commission collect and transform knowledge to produce its knowledge output? (See Appendix E for questions asked during interviews.)

Speaker	Comment
Senator Cameron Chairman	The criterion for recommendations was the people's capacity to pay. Sound briefs came from the larger organizations. Commissioners assisted in writing and discussing the Report. Mr. Cormack's input was a reflection of the Church's attitude. The minority report was the voice of the Church.
Mr. Cormack Commissioner	The other commissioners were "concerned" over the idea of a minority report. Mr. Cormack hoped that the minority report would alert the public to the government dominated curriculum and teacher education which worked against the Catholic system. He was sick of the report by the time it went in. He felt "he had been playing against a stacked deck."
Mrs. Hansen Commissioner	The Alberta Teachers' Association briefs were outstanding. The distribution of the Report was bungled. The press tended to select items only of interest to them. The public did not get a full understanding of what the recommendations were aiming at. Mr. Cormack did not have the right to present a minority report as he did—he did not hear discussions and assist in modifying or clarifying the majority report. The Calgary Herald and Basil Deane were responsible for holding back a lot of recommendations by publicity given to issues and possible swaying of public opinion.

Dr. Mowat Commissioner	The large group reports and briefs were much more important than the opinions of individuals. The recommendations were directed towards policy-making. There was great concern for equality of educational opportunity. The minority report drew more publicity because it met the needs of the press. In fact, the Separate School issue could have been accommodated within the majority report. The minority report did not affect the impact of the majority report in the long run because within the public school system was a strong consensus on the values and tasks of public education.
Mrs. Taylor Commissioner	The Teachers' brief was especially important. Mrs. Taylor was surprised that Mr. Cormack didn't assist more with input to the majority report. Press comment was ill-informed.

Phenomenological data were useful in giving the lead carried forward by the structural-functional examination which confirmed that large group briefs, and specifically those of professional educator groups, had greater impact on the Commission's management of knowledge input and thus output. These data also confirmed the structural-functional account of the transformation of knowledge input and output which led to a divergence in control and thus to the submission of majority and minority reports. The phenomenological data were useful for revealing the interaction of the actors within the Commission in the situation, and in disclosing the divergence between the majority and minority commissioners.

However,the sociology of knowledge approach added further insights. One was evidence of government influence on knowledge management in the Commission at all four stages of the Commission's life-history. A second was the development and use of power among the lay and educator personnel of the Commission in relation to the cultivation and management of "folk" and "expert" knowledge. Analysis from a sociology of knowledge perspective showed further that knowledge produced within the Commission was influenced by the differentiated development and use of power during the different phases of the Commission's work. The third was insight into the influence of professional education groups and Catholic groups outside the Commission on the knowledge management process within the Commission.

Each of these three insights from the application of the sociology of knowledge perspective, augmented by concepts from power theory, helps us to extend understanding of knowledge management and control beyond the clues and hypotheses implicit in the phenomenological data. The problematic nature of the knowledge produced by the Royal Commission was partially revealed by the interview data and in a few paragraphs of the official Report of the Commission. The sociology of knowledge approach disclosed that there was much that was problematic in the knowledge management and control of the Commission and that these problematic features were extended into the future when the Commission decided to put out as the official culmination of its effort, a majority and a minority report.

The Royal Commission of 1957-1959 in Relation to the Alberta Educational Planning Commission 1969-1972

Although the present study is concerned primarily with the Royal Commission during its emergence, official life, and termination phases, an inescapable question for the researcher as well as persons connected with the Cameron Commission was the relationship of this

Commission to its successor, the Alberta Educational Planning Commission. Commissioners, Commission staff, political and civil service office holders of 1957-1959, and Faculty of Education and Alberta Teachers' Association leaders were asked in an open-ended question to comment on the 1969 Educational Planning Commission. Further questions were asked to elicit perceptions of the relationship between the two Commissions. This is an indirect phenomenological way of looking at both Commissions and their relationship in an effort to find out more about the problematic aspects of the Cameron Commission. With the analysis of chapters three, four and five completed, it is now possible to compare the phenomenological data bearing on the two commissions with predictions feasible from the analyses.

Theme Question: What was the relationship between the Royal Commission on Education 1957-1959 and the Alberta Educational Planning Commission 1969-1972?

Speaker	Comment
Senator Cameron Chairman	The 1969 Commission followed on from the 1959 Commission—acted as another evaluation ten years later. The Cameron Commission was pragmatic and realistic.
Mr. Cormack Commissioner	The 1969 Commission was a "trial balloon" for the government which wanted to play a pre-determined tune. There was only one commissioner to avoid dissent.
Mrs. Hansen Commissioner	There had been many changes in the 60s. The second Commission was future-oriented. The Cameron Commission was concerned with reviewing the existing system with recommendations for improvement. No need was seen for the Worth Commission. There had been more demand for the Cameron Commission.
Dr. Mowat Commissioner	The Worth Commission bore no relation to the Cameron Commission. It gave more stress on

	tertiary education. The rapidity of development of the Worth Commission came as a surprise.
Mrs. Taylor Commissioner	There had been disappointment over the effects of education in the 60s—it had not lived up to expectations. The 1969 Commission stressed underlying philosophy. The Cameron Commission didn't have time for this; it was "grappling with concrete problems."
Dr. Byrne Chief Superintendent of Schools	The 1969 Commission was the result of a political decision by the "whiz kids" in the government. It was influenced by Ontario's Living and Learning Commission. The totality of education was to be studied.
Dr. Rees Commission Secretary	Faith in education in the 60s had been shaken. The government wanted to do something for ethnic groups who wanted different languages taught in schools.
Dr. Swift Deputy Minister	He did not anticipate the 1969 Commission in 1959—but was not surprised when it came. There were new problems, e.g. cost, control, tertiary education, and disillusionment over education.
Senator Manning, formerly Premier	Educational findings become obsolete quickly—there is need for change. Public interest in education was greater in 1969.
Mr. Aalborg Minister of Education	The 1960s were a decade of great change. There was need for inquiry. There was a political angle. The new Premier wanted to do something fresh.
Dr. Clarke Executive Secretary Alberta Teachers' Association	There was dissatisfaction over education especially finance, and a faith in sociology to overcome problems. He did not think there was any need for a Commission. The Hall-Dennis Report from Ontario was important.
Dr. Coutts Dean of Faculty of Education	There was a new relation between primary, secondary and tertiary education and a need to rationalize post-secondary education. There was a shift towards individual personal development and towards student activism. There were new problems to tackle.

The preferred explanation to the theme question was seen in structural-functional terms as the emergence of new problems from educational and social change, power transition from professionals to students and from power change within the provincial government. There are indications in the phenomenological data that the need for the 1969 Commission could be considered as problematic as also were its organization and procedures for producing and controlling knowledge. The phenomenological comments stressed that the Cameron Commission lacked a future-orientation and was more concerned with reform within the established institutional structure of education.

As preceding analyses are re-examined, it seems plausible that the collective behaviour interpretation of the emergence of the Cameron Commission may have relevance for explaining the emergence of the 1969 Commission. This position is reinforced by the finding from structural-functional analysis of the delay in government action on the recommendation that a permanent educational planning body be created for Alberta. This could be considered an unfulfilled goal of the Cameron Commission as a norm-oriented movement which had been institutionalized for two years.

Despite the large number of the Cameron Commission recommendations adopted, there was a residue of unadopted goals. The division of the Commission's Report into a majority and a minority section, with the former having produced most of the concrete recommendations, was evidence of a persisting goal and value difference in Alberta education, especially between professional education and the leaders of the Catholic segment of Alberta society. The sociology of knowledge analysis showed further the extent and nature of this division, especially in relation to power, and the management of knowledge by the Commission. These findings from analysis suggest the importance of applying a collective-behaviour perspective to closing activities of the Cameron Commission and to the Alberta socio-cultural context in the years between 1959 and 1969. It can be predicted from the analysis that some collective behaviour dealing with unresolved problems of power and knowledge control as well as lack of adaptation to social change by Alberta educational systems would follow the Cameron Commission's work. This prediction is examined further in the present chapter.

A Re-examination of Sociological Theory in a Quest for Meaning

The sociological theory re-examined here is selected from the theorists who have been given recognition in the sociology of education in recent years, particularly by Young in his work *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*.[2] The theorists that Young and others have made prominent in sociology of education are Marx, Durkheim, Weber and Mannheim. In addition to these, two others are selected, Neil Smelser, for his theory of collective behaviour and Pitirim Sorokin, for his typology of socio-cultural systems. Since this re-examination must be limited for reasons of time and space, and since understanding or *Verstehen* is stressed, prominent theorists of structural-functionalism are not included nor is Bourdieu, one of the rising theorists in sociology of French education. The contribution of structural-functionalism has already been exemplified in chapter four.

Marx conceived the corpus of knowledge as made up of many bodies of knowledge constructed by varying interest groups.[3] Because knowledge is linked to the particular interest group which produced it, it can never be disinterested. Knowledge is constructed in order to serve the interests of its producers, but the producers do not share the interests of the objects of knowledge, which were, in Marx's view, the masses. In this way, the corpus of knowledge was judged to be biased, invalid and also problematic. Marx was critical of historical knowledge because it was defined in two ways. Historical knowledge was considered to be abstract and disconnected with empirical description. Historians tended to take for granted commonsense definitions of events without treating them as problematic. Marx therefore treated the social world as problematic. This was done by taking things as they appeared and then subverting them to expose their real character, and thus to challenge commonly-accepted rules.

These ideas of Marx were evolved from a study of Western historical societies which were all rigidly stratified. For Marx, labour was the basic existential activity of man but because of structural deficiencies man's lot was to be alienated from his natural state and potential development. The real description of man depended on the insight of the radical, who by use of a dialectical process of observation and interpretative thought, could expose the social class biases and plots which controlled not only the masses but also the production and distribution of knowledge.

With reference to the Cameron Commission, a Marxian critique would most probably be that the Commission and its reports represented a middle-class endeavour to reassert their class dominance. In this endeavour, the objects of education, the pupils and their parents, had only a limited or negligible contribution. Further, the critique would no doubt show that the Commission was relatively insensitive to the economic problems of the Canadian West, and to the efforts made to keep the West subordinate to the control of a dominant federal-metropolitan Central Canada. Only the minority report would have received approbation for pointing out that the wishes of the parents were not given adequate consideration by the Commission and that there was a feeling of alienation from the schools prevalent in Alberta. These are some of the insights that might be generated about the Cameron Commission from Marxian theory.

What has the present study to offer to Marxian theory on its own behalf? In the first place, it has been shown that many of the structural strains emphasized in Marxian theory were related to the emergence of generalized beliefs that were part not of a revolution or value-oriented movement but of a reform or norm-oriented movement. Secondly, the study has shown that the knowledge produced did reflect group interests, particularly the interests of government, the education profession, and a vocal Catholic minority. However, it needs to be pointed out that the Cameron Commission was established in a young society, recently emerging from an agricultural-pioneer era in which lines of stratification were fluid and where the whole society, rightly or wrongly, conceived of itself as almost completely middle-class or even classless. The school system, while socially selective, reflected this lack of class in its insistence on universal, public, tax-supported education. The stratification in the educational structure, so apparent in Europe and even in Central Canada, was largely absent. In this sense, the Cameron Commission in terms of its membership and their origins as well as in its knowledge gathering through public hearings could be said to be representative of the Alberta "mass" as well as of any Alberta "elite."

There was a dialectic in the Commission processes which evolved, not a dialectic of one class confronting another but of one religious position confronting a secular-professional education front. The dialectic was expressed as essentialism versus modern progressivism. Perhaps one contribution of this case-study of a royal commission is to emphasize that the dominant dialectic in some societal situations may have a different axis than the economic. In this case, the Commission's knowledge was indeed rendered problematic by a dialectical process. However, this observation does not close off the possibility of further insight into the Commission that might be obtained from use of a Marxian perspective, especially of the relationship between knowledge and the interests of competing and conflicting groups.

Durkheim grew up in a period of history in which the traditional domination of the Church in education was becoming progressively weaker in France.[4] The multi-faceted concepts of the "sacred" and the "secular" formed part of his work. He also stressed an understanding of what it is that holds society together as a social whole. Durkheim was interested in the morally constraining quality of social norms, especially in societies which were undergoing transition because of the increasing complexity of the division of labour and the impact of urbanization.[5] He suggested that in examining any society, the moral communities of which it is composed should be discerned.[6] He further suggested that in stable societies the educational psychologist was preeminently valuable in education, but in societies undergoing change, the sociologist had the major contribution.[7]

In undertaking a study of the Cameron Commission as part of a larger social system, the province of Alberta, the idea of moral communities has some pertinence. The conflict within the Commission can be seen as a result of the strong boundaries between the moral communities to which majority and minority commissioners belonged. The conflict between the Catholic community and the secular community of professional education which became predominant in the majority report, can be seen as an extension of the very processes that had characterized European education, particularly that of France.[8] The bases of the systems of morality represented by exponents of the majority were different from the basis of the minority commissioner and his Catholic reference groups.

The minority commissioner's definition of education derived from a religious or sacred source. The majority commissioners had no ready-made, suitable secular definitions of education and its aims and appeared interested more in the process of arriving at aims through "democratic" (secular) means than in aims derived from a single philosophy of education with a sacred ontological status. The process approach of the majority members of the Royal Commission would have been heartily approved by Durkheim provided that they had called on sociologists to help them understand the major social trends requiring educational adaptation and innovation.

It is noteworthy that while some sociological data were produced for the Royal Commission through contracted research and the contributions of major briefs, the actual management and production of knowledge by the Commission and its staff was controlled largely by professional educators and psychologists who did not avail themselves of the richness of sociological theory or more advanced sociological research methods. In this respect, the Cameron Commission was geared more to the maintaining of the status quo than to making the adaptations needed within education for dealing with major social change.

Weber did not elaborate a theory of education in his work which in essence seemed to be primarily concerned with institutional renovation and re-creation. However his studies of bureaucratic organizations, religion in relation to control of education and of systems of closure including social stratification have found a place in recent sociology of education.[9] His attribution of institutional change to the interplay of groups and ideas within a social structure was expressed as the struggle for domination in society and was offered as a contrast to the Marxian view of the polarisation of conflict.[10] For Weber, the phenomenon of monopoly of political power and ideology must be taken into account in understanding the interplay between the behaviour, the interests, the ideas of competing groups. The history of education from his perspective would be a history of the transition between states of domination and assertion of different groups.[11]

The structure of the Commission itself reflected a recognition of conflicting groups in Alberta education. The present study has shown that during the life time of the Cameron Commission there was indeed a great deal of competition among groups in which groups representing teachers and professional education were able to establish and maintain a dominant position with respect to the assertion of the Catholic minority groups and in a less clear-cut fashion, groups representing parents and other agencies outside the education sector of society. The dominance-assertion theme of Weber and scholars who have carried this point forward, has only been partially developed in the present study.

Of deep concern to Weber in his search for sources of stability and change in institutions was the phenomenon of charisma. A charismatic leader was always a source of potential strain within a group because of his "gifts, virtues and special powers which set him apart."[12] In the case of the Cameron Commission, there are three instances where charismatic leadership appears to have been involved. The first was in the selection of a chairman whose background as founder of Alberta's most innovative agency for adult and continuing education and his rank as a member of the Canadian Senate, tended to set him apart. The charismatic qualities were reflected in the assessment of his leadership, particularly during the public hearings. The second kind of charisma appeared to be associated with expertise in education as evidenced by the relinquishment of many tasks, duties and writing assignments to persons on the Commission and recruited by the

Commission for these purposes. A third kind of charisma appears to be associated with the minority commissioner who, as a lawyer and a spokesman for the Catholic minority, evolved "a set apart role" which culminated in withdrawal from the main activities of the Commission and the writing of the minority report.

Weber noted the ephemeral nature of charisma and the difficulty with which it could be institutionalized. This aspect of charisma was demonstrated during the termination phase after the Commission, when commissioners reduced in status by the act of completing their report and presenting it to the government became advocates and explainers of majority or minority positions in the debate generated on release of the Commission Report.

Weber's theory of closure was based on the idea of the "solidarity shared by members which formed the basis for their mutual orientation to social action."[13] In this theory, community-group members were seen to monopolize "economic, political and/or social advantages," and through principles of closure to exclude others.[14] In the case of the Cameron Commission, there are several instances of principles of closure being invoked.

When the Commission was formed, it was given a monopolistic position or a monopoly over production of educational knowledge and policy. There was closure exercised in relation to all other reform groups in Alberta for a period of two years. A certain amount of closure was invoked in the collaboration of the Alberta Teachers' Association and the Faculty of Education with a near monopoly of professional education input into the Commission. Closure was also discernible in the coalescence of issues in the briefs presented by Catholic groups. This closure was extended into the Commission itself and concluded in the stance of the minority commissioner and the production of his report.

Much of what has been done in the present study could be put in a Weberian frame of reference to yield additional insights to those produced from the analytical perspectives adopted. This study could contribute to Weber, a case of institutional innovation designed to produce the functional equivalent of charismatic leadership within a society. In many respects a royal commission might be considered a social invention to provide special gifts, virtues, powers and a set-apart status for a selected group of people who by their efforts are expected to produce policy and knowledge that can be used for institution renovation and creation. This social invention was not part of Weber's world.

The present study in its initial conception owes much to Mannheim's perceptive work on the relationship between social structure and patterns of thinking but as with Weber, Mannheim's world was not rich in organizations such as royal commissions. In Mannheim's view,

> knowledge is distorted when it fails to take account of the new realities applying to a situation, and when it attempts to conceal them by thinking of them in categories which are inappropriate.[15]

One way of seeking "reality" is, therefore, through ideological and utopian analyses, where ideology refers to the ways of distorting reality which tend to preserve the status quo and utopia to those ways which tend to change the status quo.[16]

One type of ideological mentality is where the subject is prevented from becoming aware of the incongruity of his ideas with reality by the whole body of axioms in his historical and socially constructed thought. A second type of ideological mentality is "cant" mentality. Here the possibility of uncovering incongruence between ideas and behaviour is concealed in response to certain vital emotional interests. The third type of ideological mentality is purposeful lying or conscious deception which deliberately masks reality in order to preserve an established position.[17]

In the case of the Cameron Commission, it would appear that there is some evidence of ideological thinking in the adherence of the majority report to the strict terms of reference, to their concern with the immediate practical problems of education and practical solutions for these. There was also a vital emotional attachment to the "common" school and equality of educational opportunity as provided for by existing school laws in Alberta.

On the other hand, there are evidences that both majority and minority commissioners were utopian in their efforts to transcend the social situation of their time. In the case of the majoriy commissioners, the recommendation of a permanent educational planning body represented an aspiration for conduct which was not part of the Alberta situation of their time. Implicit in their recommendation was the hope of transforming existing historical reality into one more in line with their own conceptions. Here, the Mannheimian approach overlaps with the phenomenological for, as Mannheim emphasized, to ascertain what is ideological or utopian in a given case, requires participation in the "feelings and motives struggling for dominance over historical reality."[18]

With respect to the minority report, there appears to be oscillation between ideological and utopian concerns. In the ideological sense, the Catholic briefs and the minority commissioner stressed earlier Acts referring to their rights as a means of dealing with the realities of their situation. They were committed emotionally to a pre-existing situation which they felt obliged to re-create, in order to reap the benefits available in the past but no longer attainable to the same degree. On the other hand, the faith of the minority commissioner in an "essentialist" philosophy of education as a means of transcending the education problems, has a recognizable utopian concern. From his utopian position, the limits of the _status quo_ which were the responsibility and achievement of progressive educators, needed to be transcended in order for better conditions to prevail when parents and the Church had more say in the determination of educational objectives and all that followed therefrom. From the majority commissioners' point of view, the minority stance was clearly utopian and unrealizable.

In terms of the utopian mentality types represented in the Cameron Commission, the majority commissioners might be referred to as liberal-intellectualist. They saw their "Utopia" as achievable through better educational theory and educational planning. The minority commissioner's utopianism was rooted in a conservative idea.[20] It was more concerned with everlasting principles than with ideas.

One of the features of Mannheim's analysis of ideologies and utopias was his dependence on understanding the motives and feelings of persons and their groups who were contesting for the control of knowledge and other ways of dominating historical reality. Hence Mannheim, despite his historical concerns with groups and social class rivalries in Europe, appeared to share common ground with phenomenological sociology. In the present study, this has been demonstrated in the first part of the present chapter. From the perspective of this entire study of the Royal Commission and the possibilities of continuing the study to the Alberta Educational Planning Commission, there would appear to be the potential for empirical study of ideological and utopian types of thought and their supporting social structures in dynamic interaction over time. This Mannheimian conceptualization introduces a further dialectical process which deserves attention from students of society and education.

> Every age allows to arise (in differently located social groups) those ideas and values in which are contained in condensed form the unrealized and the unfulfilled tendencies which represent the needs of each age.[21]

Much of what Mannheim appears to have in mind in the quotation just given, falls into the purview of collective behaviour. Again, Smelser's theory of collective behaviour would seem to be valuable for assessing not only the emergence of the Commission but of its institutionalized and non-institutionalized contributions to Alberta society. As has been shown in chapter five, in the processes of knowledge management and control within the Commission, a considerable amount of behaviour contributed to the problematic outcomes of knowledge produced by the Commission. When Smelser's determinants of collective behaviour are used some of the reasons for the problematic outcomes of the Commission come into focus and in a sequence supporting Smelser's value-added conception of the determinants.

In the first place, the membership of the Commission itself was structurally conducive to problematic behaviour. Without attempting to relate each statement to the specific sources of information from which they were derived, partly to preserve the anonymity of the source, a general picture of structural conduciveness within the Commission can be written. There were two women, and four men on the Commission, therefore sex differences were present and were a factor in mobilizing internal allegiances. Further, there were rural and urban members with their potential for disagreement along this dimension. In addition, the educational backgrounds of members were different—also their occupations, thus making for occupational differences with conduciveness for divergence of opinion. The chairman was trained in agriculture with graduate work and experience in rural sociology and extension work. Further, he had the highest political status of any of the members. There was the possibility for differences of opinion to emerge based on the different positions of citizenship present. The minority commissioner held arts and law degrees and was a member of the legal profession. One member had a doctorate in educational administration and was a university professor. One member had a Bachelor of Commerce degree; one had a normal school teaching certificate. One member had no university degree but had practical experience in the business world. The most important factor of difference in the group, however, was religion. One commissioner was recommended by a Catholic bishop at the request of the government. From the outset, a problematic outcome was greatly enhanced by the explicit recognition given to the Catholic faith in Commission membership.

There appear to be two main evidences of strain within the Commission. The strain was apparent first during the transition from public hearings to research and study of documents in which the professional educators among Commission members and staff began increasingly to manage the knowledge of the Commission. The second evidence of strain was when it became apparent that the Catholic position and the interests of the minority commissioner needed to be accommodated better within the overall task of the Commission. The generalized belief that became evident early in the Commission's life regarding the special problems of education from a Catholic perspective was presented in the brief of the Catholic Conference of Alberta and elaborated in other Catholic briefs, and during the hearings of the Commission.

The precipitating factor or incident which led to the operation of social control within the Commission appears to be the presentation of the Catholic briefs especially the brief of the Catholic Conference of Alberta. As already indicated, these were followed by the calling of special experts for closed hearings by the Commission. The effort to organize a reform could be looked upon as a failure of both the majority commissioners who were unable to incorporate the minority position into their way of proceeding and by the minority commissioner who saw his appeal for further study of a philosophy of education in Alberta cut off by the pressure to bring the work of the Commission to a close six months before he thought they were ready.

Up to this point, the internal operation of the Royal Commission has been re-examined from the perspective of Smelser's determinants of collective behaviour. Before attempting to show the process of value addition, reference is made to Smelser's levels of specificity of components of action.[22] The components of action for Smelser are in order of decreasing specificity, facilities, roles, norms and values. Levels of specificity are situational facilities, mobilization of motivation for organized action, usually culminating in specific roles. This is one dimension of specificity. Another dimension of specificity for each of these relates to the concreteness or limited scope of effort in relation to facilities, roles, norms and values.

With reference to the Royal Commission, the majority members were taking societal values as they were and attempting to deal with the problems of education in Alberta in terms of general conformity to prevailing norms—that is the Education Act. They were concerned with educational norms and their modification, with the mobilization of motivation for organized action in education through roles and with situational facilities—the technology, buildings, transport and financing of education. On the other hand, the minority commissioner was concerned with societal values for an institutionalized sector of society, that is, for education. He was definitely against the sociological and environmental concept of curriculum which changed the child to his immediate environment in accordance with the dictates of the embryonic society (the school).[23] He was concerned that progressive education had the characteristics of a religion, dedicated to taking possession of the "whole" child. He saw the problem of education rooted in two conflicting ideologies—secularistic progressivism versus essentialism.[24] He argued that:

> . . . had there been unanimity concerning the primary or ultimate aims of education, the task of the Commission would have been considerably simplified, in fact, it is doubtful whether there would have been any need for a Commission. There would have been need only of re-stating the commonly held ultimate view and then, logically and clearly examining the way in which that aim was to be attained, and finally, choosing the educational measures which would be most easily adapted to the attainment of these aims.[25]

This was a call to values and the statement of a generalized belief associated with the rediscovery of values—the essential ones. In his approach, the minority commissioner was operating at the collective behaviour level of a value-oriented movement. His minority report can be looked upon as his statement appropriate for the generalized belief of such a movement. On the other hand, the majority report and its rebuttal to the minority report can be looked upon in the first instance as a moderately hostile outburst against the role of the minority commissioner because he placed their own roles in jeopardy and constituted a threat to the public school system. How could they do what was expected initially as commissioners when one of their numbers was fundamentally challenging the whole public school system they were seeking to improve, and offering as an alternative, a pluralistic society in which public education would most likely lose its legal monopoly? In the second instance, the majority commissioners appeared to conceive of their work as a norm-oriented movement in which their generalized belief had to be "sold" to the public and to the Alberta government. They were prepared to work at the level of norms, roles and facilities but not to try to say what the values of Alberta society should be with regard to education except to preserve the on-going system of public control.

From this interpretation, it is possible to understand the behaviour which followed the release of the two reports. Commissioners were in the role of agitators and prophets as they addressed public gatherings, criticizing the other's brief and trying to get a following for their own recommendations. The press, alert to the controversial aspects of the Report, tended to ignore the majority report and to discuss approvingly the minority report. Those who were challenging the school system as a whole tended to side with the minority position. In one instance, Hilda Neatby, a well-known critic of Canadian education gave public support to the minority report but when challenged by a member of the majority group from the Commission, she admitted that the stand taken was based on newpaper reports—the Report had not even been read.[26] Such behaviour, which occurred on a fairly wide scale in Alberta and Western Canada following the release of the Report, suggests that there was a collective behaviour situation created through the release of the Commission's majority and minority reports.

From a collective-behaviour approach, it can be predicted that the 1959 Royal Commission Report and the behaviour which followed immediately from it, could be a factor in the way in which the knowledge coming from the Report, both majority and minority sections, was managed. This production has relevance for further studies which might be done on educational policy-making and knowledge management in Alberta, especially for the design, management of knowledge and report emerging from the Alberta Educational Planning Commission 1969-1972.

As a final theoretical position to elicit meaning from the study of the Royal Commission, the conceptualization of socio-cultural systems and their classification developed by Pitirim Sorokin is called upon.[27] Sorokin was concerned with the largest conceivable analysable social units, short of global society, and their change over time. His unit is the socio-cultural system which contains systems, of truth and knowledge as the regulators of all other component systems including groups and institutions. The key variable for Sorokin is the source of validation of knowledge and truth. There is knowledge and truth derived from sense experience (sensate). It is in polar contrast to knowledge and truth derived from intuition, inspiration and revelation or some other "inner experience" source (ideational). From this variable he constructs three ideal types of socio-cultural system—the sensate, the ideational and the idealistic—the idealistic type being a unification of ideational and sensate types. The idealistic socio-cultural system tends to be eclectic, poorly integrated logically, with no inner synthesis of ideational components. Although the range of Sorokin's perspective cannot be fully grasped from the above brief description of his trichotomy of socio-cultural systems, it is important to apply it to the Cameron Commission, since the minority report is so readily discerned as having a strong ideational thrust.

Within the Commission itself, the knowledge management process undertaken in an idealistic manner appears to have broken down with the conflict between the idealistic and ideational approaches. The idealistic approach to the management of educational reality and educational values was unable to incorporate within its boundaries the ideational views. Thus, as has been shown, two separate knowledge outputs were the unplanned result of the Commission's work. A dual knowledge output was, in a way, a resolution of the conflict over educational knowledge—the divergence was made explicit.

The conflict over idealistic and ideational values for education was not resolved. The strain resulting from the attempt to present a framework which would meld idealistic and ideational values was reflected in the vehemence of the rebuttal of the minority position made in the majority report. This seems to support the generalization that idealism as an approach to knowledge and truth can never "rest on its laurels." It involves a continuous expenditure of energy to produce a workable dynamic knowledge relationship between ideational and sensate types of knowledge.

The knowledge and knowledge sources of the majority commissioners appear to be primarily sensate. However, the structure of the Commission and its processes appear also to be primarily idealistic. The knowledge and position of the minority report was primarily ideational in its ultimate orientation, although it was idealistic in that some sensate evidence was incorporated to support the essentially ideational stand. Further, the behaviour of the minority commissioner was characterized by what might be termed ideational lapses, when he absented himself from interaction with the rest of the Commission. His request for an extension of time to work out a philosophy of education could be interpreted as an idealistic goal, though this interpretation is open to question in the light of the major concern of the minority report for "essentialist" values and their subsequent promulgation after the Commission was formally ended.

From a Sorokian perspective, a major contribution of the Cameron Commission study is the detailed analysis of two systems of truth in interaction and of attempts by the idealistic system representatives to maintain their idealism in the face of an ideational challenge. The present study of the Commission has disclosed that in the late 1950s those concerned with the politics and the profession of education and many parents and groups in Alberta, were idealistic in their behaviour and aspirations. It remains for subsequent studies to show how Alberta society and its education have changed and are likely to change from the dynamic, unstable equilibrium of an idealistic socio-cultural system.

Summary

This chapter was an attempt to find further understanding and more plausible explanations for all the behaviour of, and all the knowledge produced by, the Cameron Royal Commission. The first part was a re-examination of the emergence, organization and function, and knowledge management and control data derived from previous chapters to compare and contrast the phenomenological, structural-functional and sociology of knowledge approaches that have been used. In the second part, a re-examination of selected aspects of the sociological theory of Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Mannheim, Smelser and Sorokin was conducted to see what further insights into the Royal Commission they yielded. In addition, some possible contributions of this particular case-study to a critical assessment of the theory under review were explored.

It was stated in the introductory chapter that one assumption to be tested in this study was that the normative and interpretative paradigms in the sociology of education are essentially complementary and that both are needed in achieving a high level of description and of explanation in sociological analysis. The re-examination carried out in the first part of chapter six has provided support from this particular study for the assumption. The re-examination of the second part has suggested that theoretical perspectives from the normative and interpretative paradigms in the sociology of education other than those used could have been drawn on in the present study.

Footnotes

[1] Upon completion of all the interviews, a copy of the questions and his/her answers was sent to each interviewee with the request that the material be altered, deleted or added to in case of misinterpretation on the researcher's part. In this way a corrected version, agreed upon by each interviewee, for use in the study was obtained. A second interview was held with one of the ex-commissioners to ensure accuracy in the interview material and in other cases additional correspondence was conducted. All the interviews are to be found in Appendix E of the study, therefore individual footnoting will not be used.

[2] M. F. D. Young, Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971).

[3] The interpretation contained in this paragraph is derived largely from A. Blum's article "The Corpus of Knowledge as a Normative Order: Intellectual Critiques of the Social Order of Knowledge and Commonsense Features of Bodies of Knowledge," in Knowledge and Control, ed. M. F. D. Young (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), pp. 122-125.

[4] John Rex, "Emile Durkheim," in The Founding Fathers of Social Science, ed. T. Raison (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1969), p. 128.

[5] Ibid., p. 132.

[6] Ibid., p. 133.

[7] E. Durkheim, Education and Sociology, trans. by S. Fox. (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956), p. 130.

[8] This struggle in Alberta has been discussed in detail in M. Lupul, "Church (Catholic)-State Relations in Education in the Old North-West Territories, 1880-1905" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1963).

[9] H. Vaughan and M. S. Archer, Social Conflict and Educational Change in England and France 1789-1848 (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), p. 16.

[10] Ibid., p. 19.

[11] Ibid., p. 23.

[12] G. Rocher, A General Introduction to Sociology: A Theoretical Perspective (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1972), p. 50.

[13] G. Neuwirth, "A Weberian Outline of a Theory of Community: Its Application to the 'Dark Ghetto,'" *British Journal of Sociology* 20 (1969): 149.

[14] Ibid., pp. 149-150.

[15] K. Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, with an introduction by Louis Wirth (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1936), p. 86.

[16] See Glossary of Terms in chapter one of the present study.

[17] K. Mannheim, op. cit., pp. 175-176.

[18] Ibid., p. 176.

[19] Ibid., p. 208.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., p. 179.

[22] The Smelser model of the components of social structure—facilities, roles, norms and values—has been referred to previously. The elaborated model mentioned here, arranges these components hierarchically with values as the highest and then lists levels within each of the components in increasing degrees of specificity. From N. Smelser, *Theory of Collective Behaviour* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 68. If one works at the value level, this necessarily includes a concern for those components below it in the hierarchy.

[23] *Report of the Royal Commission on Education*, op. cit., pp. 365-366. This contention and the following one both appeared in the section of the minority report cited.

[24] Ibid., p. 447.

[25] Ibid., p. 362.

[26] From interview with Mrs. Hansen, 6 June 1974.

[27] P. Sorokin, *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, vol. I (New York: American Book Company, 1937), pp. 66-75. In this section, Sorokin defines the meaning of ideational, idealistic and sensate and these definitions may then be applied to any socio-cultural phenomena. In any *ideational* system, reality is perceived as non-sensate and non-material, everlasting Being and its needs and ends are mainly spiritual. In any *sensate* system, reality is viewed as only that which is presented to the sense organs and needs and aims are mainly physical, while any *idealistic* system is logically integrated with a unification of ideational and sensate. Needs are both spiritual and material and aims require modification of self and the transformation of the external sensate world for their achievement.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

In general terms, the sociological study of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta aimed at both description and explanation. Aspects of the two paradigms in the sociology of education, that is, the normative and the interpretative, were used in a complementary manner to undertake the analysis and critique. The study resolved into three major components—an examination of the socio-historical context in which the Commission arose and the Commission's emergence, a descriptive account of the raison d'être and strategies of operation of the Commission in structural-functional terms and a consideration of the knowledge management and control of the Commission utilizing phenomenological sociology of knowledge which focussed on the dialectic between the socio-cultural environment and educational knowledge.

The conceptual framework for the study was composed of two different theoretical orientations; the normative concerned with "order" and the interpretative with "control."[1] As a consequence, though the aspects of methodology employed were found to be similar, the two-fold analysis rested on divergent assumptions. The Commission was taken as a "fact" of institutionalization in the analysis based on structural-functional theory whereas it was seen as a "problematic" or as a "product of social arrangements" in terms of phenomenological sociology of knowledge.[2]

The methodology consisted of techniques of historical research, systematic analysis and the survey research tool of the open-ended interview. Reliance was placed, largely, on a restricted range of data sources—Commission files, contemporary newspapers, interview responses, with some assistance from theses, reports, journals and books. The paucity of materials in this area has been commented on previously. This range of techniques was selected in order to answer the "how," "what" and "why" questions about the Commission, which contribute to an understanding of both manifest and latent features of the phenomenon. Further, the methodology was designed to obtain the "constructions of reality" of individual commissioners and others, to gain insight into social interaction associated with the Commission.

More specifically, the research may be characterized as an *ex post facto* qualitative field study of a particular educational phenomenon with a defined origin, structure, function and life-span. The selection of a Royal Commission as the focus of the study was a deliberate choice in view of the basic premise that knowledge control is the central feature of educational systems. The status of the Commission as a public body created by statute; its involvement in the selection, classification, distribution, transmission and evaluation of public educational knowledge; and its access to and exercise of power and social control made it sociologically interesting and an appropriate lens through which to examine the larger on-going educational system. Aspects of the larger educational system considered directly and indirectly, by means of a study of the Commission were the political nature of education, definitions of educational knowledge, and the filtering and distributive properties of the education system.

In the study, the Commission conceived as a social system was subjected to structural-functional analysis in order to obtain answers to such questions as "how was the Commission created and how did it operate?" however, that the Commission emerged at all was problematic. It was necessary, therefore, to augment the more standard structural-functional theory used with concepts from Smelser's theory of collective behaviour. It was also important to know "why the Commission was initiated or why recommendations of the Commission were directed as they were?" thus, selected aspects from phenomenological sociology of knowledge were drawn on. As the knowledge with which a Royal Commission is concerned is at the policy-level, a greater emphasis had to be placed on knowledge in relation to power and the decision process in policy-making. For this reason, two theoretical models relating to power were included to add to the understanding derived from the sociology of knowledge analysis.

Critique of the Methodology

The study was subject to a number of limitations. Practical difficulties were prominent. Access to materials which might have had relevance for the study of a public Commission, for example, Cabinet Minutes, reports of other Legislative Committees, or the Premier's papers, was not possible. Secondly, even when access was allowed, material was frequently incomplete. This was the case in both the Department of Education Archives and the Legislative Library.

Thirdly, assessment of the effects of the Commission should have been a legitimate concern for the study. However, this aspect could not be developed, as it would have entailed a substantial investment of time within the school system and its administrative centre. Such a concern is probably better considered as the focus of a separate study. Finally, sociological research and writing was very limited on Canadian educational commissions and other inquiries, and this was the case also, within Alberta. Thus a useful secondary source to aid in interpretation was not available.

The *ex post facto* nature of the research design imposed certain limitations on the methodology. It was inevitable that a sense of the "public dynamic"—for example, the debates, arguments, groupings of individuals and their ideas and opinions, the divisions into factions—was hard to re-create at a distance of approximately sixteen years. Interviews with those individuals who had played an important part in the Commission indicated the operation of processes such as forgetting and selective perception. The biographies, knowledge at hand and particular interests of all of these people had undergone change in the intervening period and may have altered their perceptions of the phenomenon under investigation. One of the lay commissioners was dead and therefore there was a gap in the record obtained from this central group. The interviewees, because of their high status, were able to impose certain restrictions on the researcher with regard to collection and use of phenomenological data. There were, therefore, certain weaknesses in the use of the open-ended interview.

The use of systematic analysis of, for example, Commission files and newspapers to obtain data on Commission information input and output was dictated by the overall purpose and scope of the study. The value of content analysis was recognized and would have contributed to the sections discussing definitions of education and educational knowledge. Gains in one section of the research had to be weighed against the demands, in terms of resources and time, for the remainder.

Conclusions and Implications from the Major Components of Analysis

The analysis of the Cameron Commission was conducted in three stages. In the first stage, a structural-functional approach was adopted to review major facets of Alberta and its education system over time in order to place the Commission in its socio-historical context. Further, the emergence of the Commission was traced utilizing collective behaviour theory. The structural-functional examination was continued in the second stage to gain an understanding of the operations phase and the processes of termination or destructuring of the Commission. Finally, a sociology of knowledge perspective was invoked to explore power and control in the knowledge management associated with the Commission. Conclusions and implications which may be drawn from the analysis will be re-stated briefly.

The Socio-Historical Context and Emergence of the Commission

The historical data revealed that by the 1950s there was widespread dissatisfaction over public education. Despite continued improvements and innovations in education, especially since 1947, certain problems such as the teacher shortage, inadequacies in facilities, rising enrolments and costs in education persisted and created an unstructured situation requiring reform. However, it was still problematic that a royal commission should have been called to deal with the situation. By examining the data using the collective behaviour determinants of structural conduciveness, structural strain, generalized beliefs and precipitating factors in a value-added manner, the problematic nature of the emergence of the Commission was seen to diminish. The Royal Commission was perceived as the institutionalized culmination of norm-oriented collective behaviour, a finding with implications for the study of other educational inquiries.

The Operation and Termination of the Commission

The structural-functional examination was continued in chapter four with data derived from the study of Commission files, the Commission's Report, contemporary newspaper comment, journal articles and theses. It was shown that there was a strong government influence on the structure—that is, the terms of reference, membership, budget and duration, of the Commission and thus on the functioning of the Commission.

The operation of the Commission consisted of two main phases, information gathering and evaluating, consolidating and reporting. These phases were typical of the institutionalized model of the royal commission. There was an emphasis on the collecting of public information and in this, the lay commissioners played a prominent part. The Commission was also concerned with expert or research knowledge and here the Commission's professional educators and the research personnel became dominant. An unplanned outcome of the Commission and its work was the submission of majority and minority reports. The essence of the divergence within the Commission in structural-functional terms was to be found in the minority commissioner's wish to consider values in Alberta education whereas the majority commissioners limited their concern to facilities, roles and norms.

The termination or destructuring phase of the Commission was found to be a complex process. The actions of the commissioners after the submission of the Report, the public reaction to the Report and the official decisions with regard to incorporating the recommendations of the Commission into policy were components of this process. The examination of this phase led to the conclusion that the Commission itself had resolved few educational problems. The commissioners later became agitators for further collective behaviour in education. Professional and voluntary associations connected with education, the government and the Department of Education organized themselves to carry out the Commission's recommendations over a considerable period of time. It was shown that the main participants in policy-making tended to be the professional educators. This finding, in particular, raised important questions about the nature and control of knowledge in education.

Power and Control in the Knowledge Management of the Commission

The third stage of the analysis extended inquiry into the problematic aspects within the Royal Commission and also within the Alberta education system and society. The interpretative analysis focussed in the first place on the Commission in relation to the policy context of the Alberta government. It was shown that there was government influence on the Commission's knowledge management process at each phase of its existence—official creation, organizational, operational and termination. The second focus was on power and control in knowledge management within the Commission itself. It was found that knowledge produced within the Commission was influenced by the differentiated development and use of power during the different phases of the Commission's work. The knowledge management at each phase reflected the dominant expression of power. The relationship between the Commission and outside groups other than the government was the third focus. It was seen that, while the largest volume and most highly praised knowledge submitted to the Commission came from professional educators and their associations, the input that most affected knowledge management came from the Catholic briefs. A final conclusion was that the Commission acquired a management task even more critical than the managing of knowledge. This was the management of values.

The implications from this analysis are both practical and theoretical. In considering an educational phenomenon of the order of a public educational inquiry, an essential substratum is the knowledge gained from its socio-historical background, structure and function. However, if explanation, as well as description, is required, ways of abstracting meaning from these data must be employed. In this study, theoretical perspectives ranging from structural-functional theory augmented with collective behaviour concepts and complemented by sociology of knowledge theory to which had been added selected power concepts were utilized. Further, there was recognition of the practical and theoretical contribution of the phenomenological perspective. Chapter six of the study, by synthesising the facts and conclusions generated by the other chapters, has provided support for the foregoing argument. The critical review of theory which comprised the second part of that chapter was intended partly to reveal theoretical perspectives which might have found a place in this particular study.

Critical Assessments of the Royal Commission as a Whole

This study of the Royal Commission would not be complete without an attempt to report critical assessments of it by persons concerned with it, including the present researcher. Here the focus is on the Commission and its work as a whole, in what might be termed its 'global' aspects. In the following paragraphs, a number of different criteria are used to answer four questions: how successful was the Royal Commission for different sectors of Alberta society? How well did it fulfill its knowledge management and control responsibilites? Did the Commission achieve its purpose in providing guidelines for educational reform? To what extent did the Commission help set the stage for more collective behaviour related to problems of education in Alberta's dynamic society of the 1960s? The answers to these questions, drawn primarily from the foregoing chapters and including some insights from phenomenological data, may be considered as conclusions appropriate to the present study, and also as challenges for further inquiry.

How successful was the Commission? Different sectors of Alberta society had different views. The government, which created, financed and ostensibly benefitted most directly from the Commission could be said to be pleased with the Commission as an institutionalized way of dealing with a serious problem situation. The Commission met most expectations. It produced a creditable written report and did so within a reasonable period of time and well within the budget established. In these external respects, the Commission was an unquestioned success. However, as shown in this study, there were unexpected, problematic aspects of the Commission's work which were of concern to the government most especially the production of a majority and a minority report. In spite of this, it can be concluded that the government's actions in implementing nearly half of the Commission recommendations by the time the report was published and in establishing a special Departmental Committee to advise the minister on the disposal of the remaining recommendations, reflected the success of the Commission and of its majority report.

There is one dimension of the Commission that cannot be so judged and which requires a different kind of assessment from that possible from the present study. How successful was the Commission in terms of the political advantages it conferred? Did it strengthen or weaken the position of the government of the day in Alberta politics? These are questions that could be of concern to a political scientist.

From the standpoint of the Alberta press as represented by the major daily papers, the Commission was a mixed success. The minority report was for them a vindication of their previous editorial views about education in Alberta and provided further reason for the press to continue its criticism of the Alberta government and its public education establishment. The majority report, from the press viewpoint, was partially satisfactory, especially regarding the training of teachers, but in other ways, was considered lacking. This conclusion should be further tested by a more rigorous analysis of the Alberta press, including the rural press, in relation to the Commission.

The people of Alberta, as represented by the Alberta Home and School constituency, appeared pleased with the Commission and its recommendations. For at least two years the report was studied and discussed throughout the province in local home and school associations which encouraged the implementation of Commission recommendations in resolutions addressed to the Premier and cabinet. This assessment of the Commission needs to be supplemented by study of other associations and segments of Alberta society.

What of the commissioners themselves? Did they view their Commission as successful? There are three kinds of evidence which suggest they did see their Commission as a success. The first is

9

speaking and writing activities of the commissioners after the Commission's work was officially concluded. This activity reflected a high valuation of the Commission's work on the part of the majority commissioners and in the case of the minority commissioner, it reflected a high valuation of the minority contributions to the Commission.

A second kind of evidence is found in remarks of the commissioners. Senator Cameron and the minority commissioner both commented in interviews that people still talk to them about the Commission.[3] Senator Cameron further added that the Commissions in Manitoba and British Columbia seem to have been forgotten.[4] This assessment suggests a continuing interest in the Cameron Commission and also a need for further research to test the accuracy of the assessment relative to other Commissions.

A third kind of evidence is less direct, but no less compelling. It was the willingness of all the living commissioners to speak frankly about the Commission during lengthy open-ended interviews and to follow these with additional written or interview information. Despite various criticisms of the Commission, there was consensus, suggested by words and action, about the positive contribution of the Commission to Alberta education and society, and that it was a good way of gathering information and of making recommendations.

However, not all overall assessments of the Commission were so favourable. The then Dean of the Faculty of Education said the Commission was positive for its "therapeutic effect," but he felt the report was not "a particularly good device for influencing change."

The real change-agents in education were the "fraternity of individuals" from different organizations, the university, the teaching profession, the trustees, the civil service, the home and school association, who sat on committees and dealt with the problems of education. These people "put education ahead of almost everything else."[5] The then Premier of Alberta also expressed the opinion that the Royal Commission was "not very influential with respect to change," but it was effective in "stimulating public discussion and perhaps changing attitudes." On the whole, he saw the value of royal commissions as "over-rated." There are "relatively a small number of recommendations implemented considering the expense involved."[6]

There is little that the present study can add to contradict these phenomenological assessments of the Commission seen globally, or as a whole. Other studies are needed to compare the Commission with other commissions, to relate it to the political scene, to public opinion and the operations of the media, from which general assessments of the relative success of the Commission might be made. Perhaps the most critical consideration is what influence the Cameron Commission had on schools and related aspects of education in Alberta, but this too, requires separate and further study.

However, the present study does permit some general answers to the remaining three questions. With regard to how the Commission fulfilled its knowledge management and control responsibilities, it would appear on the surface that the Commission handled these responsibilities well. There was a large input of knowledge from briefs, hearings, expert witnesses and, to a lesser extent, from research. The output was two hundred and eighty specific recommendations from the majority commissioners. The fact that the output was from a Royal Commission tended to legitimate these recommendations, except for the minority commissioner and those accepting his essentialist criticism of the majority effort. As the present study has shown, the majority management of knowledge was influenced strongly by the expertise of educators and in indeterminate ways by close association with government. On the other hand, the management of knowledge within the Commission by the minority commissioner reflected the influence of Catholic associations and education groups.

The minority commissioner and subsequently the Catholic archbishops and bishops of Alberta deplored the management of knowledge by the Commission, affirming that none of the requests from Catholic briefs had been taken into account by the majority commissioners. Despite these criticisms, the majority commissioners did set a pattern of knowledge and control which not only was dominant in their final report, but appears to have been accepted and followed in the subsequent work of the special Department of Education Committee which concentrated its efforts on evaluating majority recommendations. The allegation of the minority commissioner that the majority commissioners ignored much of the input from the people in making recommendations remains enigmatic, in view of the support from government, education and home and schools for the Commission recommendations, once the report was published. A content analysis[7] of the briefs of "the people" as well as those of associations is needed to determine the extent to which the Commission managed knowledge in such a way that the suggestions for educational reform from "the people" were minimized.

Did the Commission achieve its purpose in providing guidelines for educational reform? The first, and obvious answer to this question, is that the Commission achieved a set of guidelines in keeping with the educational policy of that time. More than one hundred and forty recommendations were either being implemented or to be implemented in 1959 when the report was submitted. As a corollary, few of the Commission's recommendations were rejected when the minister's statement[8] was made in 1961. However, there was criticism by the minority commissioner[9] and the minister of education[10] about the lack of attention to aims of education in the recommendations. In addition, there was criticism by the Special Departmental Committee on deficiencies in the framing of the recommendations.[11] It was said that many of them were unclear, especially as regards to whom they were directed which increased the difficulty of their evaluation.

Not all the recommendations were acted upon nor were they implemented expeditiously. Those recommendations which were delayed or remained inactive tended to be the more innovative, for example, a planning body was not established until 1969, accreditation was not introduced until 1971 and the office of adult education became a co-ordinator of further education in 1971. These examples suggest that the Commission provided an impetus more than guidelines to educational reforms already in process. They also raise the general question of how innovative it is possible for a royal commission to be in its recommendations for policy.

The slowness of innovation of certain of the recommendations of the Commission meant that there was a residue of unfulfilled expectations among members of the Commission and others outside it. In other words, the stage was set for more collective behaviour related to education in Alberta's changing society.

There appear to be several ways in which the Cameron Commission was potentially, and even directly, a contributor to further collective behaviour related to education in Alberta. Recourse is made again to the Smelser determinants of collective behaviour to find meaning in the post-Cameron report situation.

While the Commission did make many recommendations about the logistics of education and teacher qualifications, it did not resolve strains associated with the local-provincial hiatus and educational standards. Possibly even more important was the relationship of the Commission to the eight factors of structural conduciveness identified in chapter three. The majority report avoided discussion of the struggle between the value positions of pragmatic materialism and traditional idealism in Alberta culture. It gave little attention to ethnic diversity in Alberta, to the diffusion of American culture through education and none to Western Canada-Eastern Canada grievances. These residual conduciveness factors remained after the Commission had completed its work. They would no doubt be factors in subsequent collective behaviour associated with education in Alberta.

One unexpected consequence of the Commission was the conversion of the state-church conduciveness factor to a strain factor and to a generalized belief associated with an incipient value-oriented movement to re-define the Catholic position in Alberta society and its education. This occurred through the work of the minority commissioner. His minority report was an eloquent ideological expression of a latent generalized belief awaiting incorporation into a movement. The majority report and the subsequent activities of the Department of Education's Special Committee can, in a sense, be regarded as the reaction of the agencies of social control to inhibit the development of such a movement. The actual and potential contribution of the Cameron Commission to collective behaviour associated with interaction between education and religion in Alberta society is one that can be expected to be of recurring importance. Further research is needed to understand fully this strain in the years following the Cameron Commission and the impact of the strain on the design and operation of the Alberta Educational Planning Commission.

Another way in which collective behaviour was encouraged as a consequence of the Commission and of the follow-up activities, was the delay in implementation of innovative recommendations such as accreditation, an adult education office and a permanent educational planning body. Although the delay in implementation was not the direct responsibility of the Commission, unfulfilled recommendations could then serve two purposes. They could be part of a generalized belief to strengthen the collective behaviour or the Commission recommendations could be used to legitimize reform action decisions taken to deal with a new crisis situation such as might occur as politicians or educational administrators seek to justify new policies or regulations. In these ways, the Cameron Commission recommendations may be said to have constituted latent factors in collective behaviour.

Further Research Suggestions

Throughout the present study attention has been drawn to possibilities for further research and theoretical development. The focus on power and control in knowledge management is a very recent development in the sociology of education. This has five related consequences which have come into prominence as a result of this study and which lead to further suggestions for research.

Firstly, there has not been an extensive sampling of the rich store of theoretical perspectives available in sociology in order to compare their heuristic value. The review of theory in chapter six of the present study has indicated that further studies of the Cameron Commission might be conducted using, for example, Marxian or Weberian theory as the basis for analysis. The need to augment structural-functionalism, in this case with collective behaviour theory, requires further testing.

In the second place, the application of these newer theoretical interests to actual educational phenomena remains extremely limited. The present study has extended these newer theoretical interests to a limited phenomenon, a royal commission, but there are very many institutions and agencies, both within education and outside, which need to be examined in terms of power and control in knowledge management.

A third suggestion is related. More attention needs to be given by the sociology of knowledge to knowledge management and control in both institutional contexts and environing socio-cultural factors. The present study has demonstrated that in a limited phenomenon, a royal commission, institutional and socio-cultural factors were both essential to understand its knowledge management and control. It can be assumed that the same attention to institutional contexts and social environments would be needed in other studies of a similar nature regardless of their scope or scale.

A fourth consequence of the newness of this theory is that there are few longitudinal, before and after studies of knowledge management. Further research is needed to find out the effects of the Cameron Commission, and particularly the effects of its recommendations on Alberta education; in the Department of Education, in professional and volunteer associations connected with education, in large areas of school administration such as divisions or counties, and in particular schools and classrooms. The three administrative studies of the Alberta Royal Commission on Education[12] do not begin to disclose all the understanding social scientists and educators need of the impact and consequences of the Cameron Commission at various levels of education in Alberta.

Finally, the focus on power and control in knowledge management directs attention to historical and comparative studies. The historical survey in chapter three of the present study has shown the recurrence of educational inquiries in the province and it is already a fact that the Cameron Commission has been superseded by the Alberta Educational Planning Commission of 1969-1972. With a succession of inquiries, it would be possible to undertake systematic historical study and, perhaps sociological analysis, of knowledge management and control by these various inquiries. Similarly, as noted from attention called to the royal commissions on education being held in other provinces at approximately the same time as the Cameron Commission, comparative study of commissions would be possible in Western Canada and also in Canada as a whole. It would be particularly interesting to compare the Cameron Commission with the Royal Commission on Education in Quebec, the Parent Commission, or the one in Ontario, the Hope Commission. This comparative aspect could extend to inquiries on education in other countries. In these kinds of historical and comparative studies, the newer sociology of education theory could be rigorously tested.

Concluding Statement

The main purpose of the study was to undertake a sociological analysis of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta 1957-1959. The contribution of the study has been, firstly, the selection of the problem which has attempted to probe one of the newer areas in the sociology of education—the focus on the organization, legitimation and control of knowledge itself. It is of further significance that within this area, which has begun to attract an increasing number of studies on knowledge management and control through curriculum, the present study has moved into the field of knowledge control outside the school by agencies such as government. A second contribution has been the testing of the assumption that the normative and interpretative paradigms are essentially complementary. Theoretical perspectives from structural-functionalism and sociology of knowledge, augmented with concepts of collective behaviour and power, have resulted in a more thorough and complete description and explanation of a specific educational phenomenon related to the social control of knowledge. A third contribution has reference to the subject of the study. The Royal Commission on Education was indeed a concrete example of the processes of distribution of power and principles of social control in relation to educational knowledge, but as this study has shown, the Royal Commission was also the institutionalized culmination of norm-oriented collective behaviour. The Commission was both a "fact" of institutionalization and a "problematic" or, in other words, a product of a diversity of social arrangements and actions. Further, as this study has also shown, the Commission itself has contributed certain problematic aspects to Alberta society as well as contributing to the resolution of Alberta educational problems. The researcher who studies educational change or reform after the Cameron Commission, especially for the period 1959-1969, might be well advised to hypothesize that in some way the Commission itself and its report are factors in the collective behaviour or reform efforts that the researcher may be studying.

Footnotes

[1] A. Dawe, "The Two Sociologies," British Journal of Sociology 21 (1970): 207-218.

[2] This view was explored in detail in the analysis chapters, four and five, and in the chapter of comparison, that is chapter six. The terminology derives from the work in British sociology of education referred to in the dissertation.

[3] From interviews with Senator Cameron, 24 July, 1974 and Mr. Cormack, 24 May, 1974.

[4] From interview with Senator Cameron, 24 July, 1974.

[5] From interview with Dean Coutts, 27 May, 1974.

[6] From interview with Senator Manning, 2 July, 1974.

[7] Some content analysis of Cameron Commission briefs was used by Caldwell in his study on values which was referred to, initially, in chapter two, footnote 6.

[8] Statement Regarding Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education, tabled in the Alberta Legislature by the Minister of Education, 17 March, 1961.

[9] From interview with Mr. Cormack, 24 May, 1974.

[10] From interview with Mr. Aalborg, 27 May, 1974.

[11] Reported in interview with Dr. Swift, 29 May, 1974.

[12] These studies conducted by Daloise, Maddocks and Wilcer in 1970 were noted initially in chapter two, footnote 8.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allen, R., ed. *A Region of the Mind*. University of Saskatoon, Regina: Canadian Plains Study Centre, 1973.

Banks, O. *The Sociology of Education*. London: Batsford, 1968.

Berger, P., and Luckmann, T. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.

Bierstedt, R. *The Social Order*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1957.

Blishen, B.; Jones, F.; Naegle, K.; and Porter, J., eds. *Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1968.

Boocock, S. *An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Boyle, E., and Crosland, A. *The Politics of Education*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1971.

Brown, R., ed. *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change*. London: Tavistock, 1973.

Card, B. Y. *The Canadian Prairie Provinces from 1870 to 1950*. Toronto: J. M. Dent, 1960.

________. *Trends and Changes in Canadian Society*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1968.

Careless, J., and Craig-Brown, R., eds. *The Canadians—1867-1967*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1967.

Chalmers, John. *Schools of the Foothills Province*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Chapman, R., ed. *The Role of Commissions in Policy-Making*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1973.

Clark, S. D. *Church and Sect in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948.

________. *The Developing Canadian Community*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

________, ed. *Urbanism and the Changing Canadian Society*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

Clokie, H., and Robinson, J. *Royal Commissions of Inquiry*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1937.

Cohen, P. *Modern Social Theory*. London: Heinemann, 1968.

Cox, R., and Jacobson, H. *The Anatomy of Influence: Decision Making in International Organization*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.

Crane, D. *Invisible Colleges: Diffusion of Knowledge in Scientific Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Crawford, E., and Biderman, A., eds. *Social Scientists and International Affairs*. New York: John Wiley, 1969.

Dahlke, H. *Values in Culture and Classroom*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Dickie, D. *The Enterprise in Theory and Practice*. Toronto: Gage, 1941.

Doern, G., and Aucoin, P. *The Structures of Policy-Making in Canada*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1971.

Dror, Y. *Design for Policy Sciences*. New York: American Elsevier, 1971.

________. *Ventures in Policy Sciences*. New York: American Elsevier, 1971.

Etzioni, A. *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations*. New York: Free Press, 1961.

________. *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Filmer, P.; Phillipson, M.; Silverman, D.; and Walsh, B. *New Directions in Sociological Theory*. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1972.

Funk, I., ed. *New Standard Dictionary of the English Language*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1963.

Gould, J., and Kolb, W., eds. *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1964.

Gove, P., ed. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam, 1966.

Halsey, A.; Floud, J.; and Anderson, C., eds. Education, Economy and Society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961.

Hansen, D., and Gerstl, J., eds. On Education Sociological Perspectives. New York: John Wiley, 1967.

Hanser, C. Guide to Decision: The Royal Commission. New Jersey: Bedminster Press, 1965.

Hanson, E. J. Local Government in Alberta. Canada: McClelland and Stewart, 1956.

Hardy, W. G. Education in Alberta. Calgary Herald, 1954.

Henderson, G. F. Federal Royal Commissions in Canada 1867-1966: A Checklist. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Hooke, A. J. 30 + 5. I Know, I Was There. Edmonton, Alberta: Co-op Press, 1971.

Hopper, E., ed. Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems. London: Hutchinson, 1971.

Irving, J. A. The Social Credit Movement in Alberta. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.

Ishwaran, K., ed. The Canadian Family. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Jackson, B., and Marsden, D. Education and the Working Class. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Johnson, F. H. A Brief History of Canadian Education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Kahn, R., and Cannell, C. The Dynamics of Interviewing. New York: John Wiley, 1957.

Katz, Joseph. Elementary Education in Canada. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

________. Society, Schools and Progress in Canada. Oxford: Pergamon, 1969.

Lasswell, Harold. A Pre-View of Policy Sciences. New York: American Elsevier, 1971.

Lloyd, W. S. The Role of Government in Canadian Education. Toronto: Gage, 1959.

Loomis, C. P. Social Systems. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1960.

MacGregor, J. G. A History of Alberta. Edmonton, Alberta: Hurtig, 1972.

MacKinnon, Frank. The Politics of Education. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960.

MacPherson, C. Democracy in Alberta. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1953.

Mann, W. Sect, Cult, and Church in Alberta. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1955.

________, ed. Canada: A Sociological Profile. Canada: Copp Clark, 1971.

Mannheim, K. Ideology and Utopia. With an introduction by Louis Wirth. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1936.

March, J. G., ed. Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Enlarged ed. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Morton, W. L. The Canadian Identity. 2nd ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972.

________. The Progressive Party in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.

Myrhe, A.; Bryce, R.; and McIntosh, R., eds. School Administration and the Valuing Process. Edmonton, Alberta: Council on School Administration, Alberta Teachers' Association, in press.

Neatby, Hilda. So Little for the Mind. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1953.

Open University Team. School and Society: A Sociological Reader. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Phillips, C. The Development of Education in Canada. Toronto: W. J. Gage, 1957.

Priestley, N., and Swindlehurst, E. Furrows, Faith and Fellowship. Edmonton, Alberta: Co-op Press, 1967.

Rocher, Guy. A General Introduction to Sociology. Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1972.

Schutz, Alfred. *Collected Papers*. Vol. I: *The Problems of Social Reality*. Edited by Maurice Natanson. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962.

_______. *Collected Papers*. Vol. II: *Studies in Social Theory*. Edited by A. Brodersen. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964.

_______. *Collected Papers*. Vol. III. *Studies in Phenomenological Sociology*. Edited by I. Schutz. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970.

Smelser, N. *Theory of Collective Behavior*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Sorokin, P. A. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Vol. I. New York: American Book Company, 1937.

_______. *Society, Culture and Personality*. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1962.

Thomas, L. G. *The Liberal Party in Alberta 1905-1921*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.

Uhlman, H. *Rural Alberta: Patterns of Change*. Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1961.

Vaughan, H., and Archer, M. S. *Social Conflict and Educational Change in England and France 1789-1848*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1971.

Westby-Gibson, D. *Social Perspectives on Education: The Society, the Student, the School*. New York: John Wiley, 1965.

Willer, Judith. *The Social Determination of Knowledge*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Williams, W. *Social Policy Research and Analysis*. New York: American Elsevier, 1971.

Wilson, J.; Stamp, R.; and Audet, L. *Canadian Education: A History*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Wraith, R., and Lamb, G. *Public Inquiries as an Instrument of Government*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1971.

Young, M. F., ed. *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Ziman, J. *Public Knowledge*. Oxford: The University Press, 1968.

Published Reports

Alberta. Bureau of Statistics. *Alberta Industry and Resources*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1959.

Alberta. Department of Education. *Advance in Secondary Education in Alberta*. Edmonton: King's Printer, 1951.

Alberta. Department of Education. *Annual Reports*. Edmonton: King's/Queen's Printer, 1940-1962.

Alberta. Legislative Assembly. *Alberta's Economic Prospects*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1955.

Alberta. Legislative Assembly. *Journals*. Edmonton: King's/Queen's Printer, 1940-1962.

Alberta. Commission on Educational Planning. *Report*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1972.

Alberta. Royal Commission on Education in Alberta. *Report*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1959.

Alberta Teachers' Association. *Brief to the Department of Education on Certain Aspects of the Cameron Commission Report*. Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1960.

Andrews, J. *Public and Professional Opinion Regarding the Tasks of the Public Schools of Alberta*. Edmonton: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, 1959.

British Columbia. Royal Commission on Education. *Report*. Victoria: Queen's Printer, 1960.

Casey, I. *Alberta's Educational Scene*. Edmonton: Alberta Department of Education, 1952.

Hanson, E. J. *Financing Education in Alberta*. Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1972.

Ingram, E. *The Cameron Commission--Two Years After*. Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1961.

Ingram, E., and West, L. *A Review of Educational Opportunity*. Edmonton: Human Resources Research Council, 1971.

Larson, L. *The Family in Alberta*. Edmonton: Human Resources Research Council, 1971.

McDougall, W. D. *The First Forty Years: The Education Society of Edmonton, 1927-1967*. n.p., 1967.

Manitoba. Royal Commission on Education. Report. n.p., 1959.

Ontario. Royal Commission on Education. Report. Toronto: King's Printer, 1950.

Saskatchewan. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. Report No. 6. Regina: Queen's Printer, 1956.

Uhlman, H. Rural Alberta: Patterns of Change. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1961.

Journal Articles

"American Influence on Progressive Education in Canada." Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society (Papers and proceedings of the 1972 Meeting): 1-23.

Bachrach, P., and Baratz, M. "Decisions and Non Decisions: An Analytical Framework." American Political Science Review 57 (1963): 632-642.

Barber, B. "Structural-Functional Analysis: Some Problems and Misunderstandings." American Sociological Review 21 (1956): 129-135.

Bottomore, T. "Some Reflections on the Sociology of Knowledge." British Journal of Sociology 7 (1956): 52-58.

Byrne, T. "The Development of Design in Alberta's Education." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 3 (1957): 72-80.

Cameron, D. "The Majority Report." The Alberta School Trustee 30 (1960): 9-15.

"The Cameron Commission." The ATA Magazine 38 (1958): 15-18.

"Cameron Report Seminars Held." Home and School News 12 (1961): 7.

Clarke, S. C. T. "The Cameron Report." The ATA Magazine 40 (1960): 9-155.

Collins, C. "Local School District Organization in Canada." Canadian Education and Research Digest 1 (1961): 5-24.

Collins, R. "Reassessments of Sociological History: The Empirical Validity of the Conflict Tradition." Theory and Society 1 (1974): 147-178.

Dale, R. "Phenomenological Perspectives and the Sociology of the School." Educational Review 25 (1973): 175-179.

Dawe, A. "The Two Sociologies." British Journal of Sociology 21 (1970): 207-218.

Duncan, O., and Schnore, L. "Cultural, Behavioral, and Ecological Perspectives in the Study of Social Organization." American Journal of Sociology 65 (1959): 132-146.

Gurwitsch, A. "The Commonsense World as a Social Reality." Social Research 29 (1962): 50-72.

Hansen, W. "Fundamental Principles in the Cameron Report." Home and School News 11 (1960): 1-2.

Hindness, B. "The Phenomenological Sociology of Alfred Schutz." Economy and Society 1 (1972): 1-27.

Hohol, A. "Factors Associated with School Drop-Outs." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 1 (1955): 7-17.

Jonason, J. "The Large Units of School Administration in Alberta." Canadian Education 7 (1952): 51-63.

Lazerte, M. E. "Fifty Years of Education in Alberta." The ATA Magazine 35 (1955): 46-50.

Linton, T., and Swift, D. "Social Class and Ninth Grade Educational Achievement." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 9 (1963): 157-167.

Loken, G. "Perspectives on Change in Educational Structures in Alberta." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 15 (1969): 207-223.

Lupul, M. "Education in Western Canada." Comparative Educational Review 1 (1967): 144-159.

McCall, R. "The Rural High School in Alberta." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 2 (1956): 105-113.

McCullough, R. "Cameron Commission Report." Home and School News 11 (1960): 3.

Mills, C. W. "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive." American Sociological Review 5 (1940): 904-913.

Mowat, G. L. "Whose Responsibility Now?" Home and School News 12 (1960): 5.

Mullins, N. "The Distribution of Social and Cultural Properties in Informal Communication Networks among Biological Scientists." American Sociological Review 33 (1968): 786-797.

Neuwirth, G. "A Weberian Outline of a Theory of Community: Its Application to the 'Dark Ghetto.'" British Journal of Sociology 20 (1969): 148-163.

Oromaner, M. "Comparison of Influentials in Contemporary American and British Sociology: A Study in the Internationalization of Sociology." British Journal of Sociology 21 (1970): 324-332.

Patterson, R. S. "F. W. G. Haultain: Educational Statesman of the Canadian West." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 3 (1962): 85-93.

Pearse, A. "Introduction: Sociologists and Education." International Social Science Journal 19 (1967): 313-324.

Rancier, G. "Case Studies of High School Drop Outs." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 9 (1963): 13-21.

"Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education." The ATA Magazine 40 (1959): 22-38.

"A Review of Education in Alberta." The Alberta School Trustee 29 (1959): 8-12.

Rioux, M. "Itinéraires Socioloques." Recherches Sociographiques 15 (1974): 311-312.

Thomson, K. "Religious Institutions in 'Alberta's Public Schools.'" Alberta Journal of Educational Research 13 (1967): 65-73.

Walker, B. "The Administration of High Schools in Alberta during the Territorial Period, 1889-1905." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 2 (1956): 96-104.

"What's Ahead?" The ATA Magazine 40 (1960): 4-5.

Worth, W. "An Analysis of the Editorial Treatment of Education in the Alberta Press." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 1 (1955): 54-62.

Young, M. F. "On the Politics of Educational Knowledge." Economy and Society 1 (1972): 194-215.

Zentner, H. "Parental Behavior and Student Attitudes Toward Further Training." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 9 (1963): 22-30.

Newspapers

The *Albertan*, 1957-1961.

The *Calgary Herald*, 1957-1961.

The *Edmonton Journal*, 1956-1962.

The *Gateway*, 1959.

Newspaper Hansards, 1940-1962. Legislative Library, Edmonton, Alberta.

Unpublished Material

Archival Material

Byrne, T. C. *Collected Speeches and Writings*. Vol. II, 1971. Athabasca University, Edmonton, Alberta.

President's Files, 1956-1961. University of Alberta Archives, Edmonton, Alberta.

Royal Commission Files, 1957-1959. Department of Education Archives, Edmonton, Alberta.

Interviews

Aalborg, A. Private interview at University of Alberta, 27 May 1974.

Byrne, T. Private interview at Athabasca University, 14 June 1974.

Cameron, D. Private interview at School of Advanced Management, Banff, Alberta, 31 July 1974.

Clarke, S. Private interview at University of Alberta, 13 June 1974.

Cormack, J. Private interview at 14023 - 100 Avenue, Edmonton, 24 May and 24 June 1974.

Coutts, H. Private interview at University of Alberta, 27 May and 3 June 1974.

Hansen, W. Private interview at 2915 Champlain Street, Calgary, 6 June 1974.

MacArthur, R. Private interview at University of Alberta, 25 May 1974.

Manning, E. Private interview at Confederation Building, Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, 2 July 1974.

Mowat, G. Private interview at University of Alberta, 17 June 1974.

Rees, R. Private interview at University of Alberta, 30 May 1974.

Swift, W. Private interview at 5108 - 114B Street, Edmonton, 29 May 1974.

Taylor, I. Private interview at 5th Avenue, Wainwright, Alberta, 28 May 1974.

Papers

Eggleston, S. J. "Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education." University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

________. "Knowledge and the School Curriculum." University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

________. "Sociology and the Sociology of Education." University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Ferge, Z. "Relations Between the School Structure and the Structure of Educational Knowledge." Paper Prepared for Working Group 4 (Science, Technology and Education Problems) of the VIIIth World Congress of Sociology, Toronto, 1974.

Miklos, E.; Daloise, D.; Maddocks, G.; and Wilcer, A. "Implementation of Recommendations by the Alberta Royal Commission on Education, 1959." University of Alberta, 1970. (Typewritten.)

Theses

Bercuson, L. "Education in the Bloc Settlements of Western Canada." Master's thesis, McGill University, 1941.

Caldwell, G. "Educational Values in Alberta—A Comparison of the Orientations of the Department of Education and Interest Groups." Master's thesis, University of Calgary, 1968.

Card, B. Y. "American Educational Sociology from 1890 to 1950: A Sociological Analysis." Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1959.

Daine, P. J. "Educational Knowledge Codes: An Analysis of the Bernstein Typology." Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1974.

Daloise, D. "A Study of the Degree of Implementation of Recommendations Pertaining to Organization and Administration Made by the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, 1959." Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

Goulson, C. "An Historical Survey of Royal Commissions and Other Major Governmental Inquiries in Canadian Education." Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1966.

Hodgson, E. D. "The Nature and Purposes of the Public School in the Northwest Territories (1885-1905) and Alberta (1905-1963)." Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1964.

La Fosse, J. J. "The Degree of Implementation of Certain Recommendations of the Newfoundland Royal Commission on Education and Youth." Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

Lupul, M. "Church (Catholic)-State Relations in Education in the Old North-West Territories, 1880-1905." Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1963.

Maddocks, G. "A Study of the Degree of Implementation of Recommendations Pertaining to the Supply, Preparation, and Payment of Teachers made by the Alberta Royal Commission on Education, 1959." Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

Patterson, R. S. "The Establishment of Progressive Education in Alberta." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

Sugden, T. "The Consolidated School Movement in Alberta 1913-1963." Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.

Wilcer, A. "A Study of the Implementation of Recommendations Pertaining to Control of Education made by the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, 1959." Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMPARISON OF SELECTED FEATURES OF ROYAL COMMISSIONS IN CANADIAN EDUCATION

1. A CHECKLIST OF POSTWAR EDUCATIONAL INQUIRIES IN WESTERN PROVINCES

ALBERTA

1943: Post-War Reconstruction Committee [Sub-committee on Education and Vocational Training]

1947-48: Royal Commission on Taxation [Finance for schools]

1954-56: Royal Commission on Metropolitan Development [School finances in Calgary and Edmonton]

1957-58: Royal Commission on Teachers' Salaries

1957-59: Royal Commission on Education [Elementary and Secondary Education]

Committees of Inquiry

1958: Hutterite Investigation Committee

1963: Survey Committee on Higher Education

BRITISH COLUMBIA

1944-45: Inquiry into Educational Finances [Consolidation of schools]

1946-47: Royal Commission on Provincial-Municipal Relations

1948: Royal Commission on School Taxation

1947-48: Royal Commission on Doukhobor Affairs

1950-52: Committee of Social Scientists on the Doukhobor Problem

1958-60: Royal Commission on Education

1962: Study on Higher Education in British Columbia

MANITOBA

1944-45: Special Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly [Larger administrative units—educational standards—higher salaries]

1945-47: Royal Commission on Adult Education

1955-65: 3 Royal Commissions and 3 other official investigations on aspects of education

SASKATCHEWAN

1948-50: Committee on Fiscal Relations [between provincial government and various municipal bodies]

1952-57: Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life [Rural education]

1962-63: Committee on Continuing Education

1962-65: Royal Commission on Taxation [Section on local finances for education]

Reference: C. F. Goulson, An Historical Survey of Royal Commissions and Other Major Governmental Inquiries in Canadian Education, (D.Ed. Thesis, University Toronto, 1966), Ch. 13.

2. MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF SELECTED PROVINCIAL ROYAL COMMISSIONS ON EDUCATION

ALBERTA	BRITISH COLUMBIA	MANITOBA	SASKATCHEWAN
CAMERON COMMISSION	CHANT COMMISSION	MACFARLANE COMMISSION	AGRICULTURE & RURAL LIFE COMMISSION
1957-59:	1958-60:	1958-59:	1952-57:
1. Authority for curriculum objectives and content—Dept. of Education—methods—teacher education and teachers; 3 stream High School program—academic, general, vocational.	1. Emphasis on promoting intellectual development.	1. 'Essentialist' or conservative stress in curriculum.	1. Regrouping of schools in village or town centres.
2. Higher admission requirements for teacher education and minimum 4-year B.Ed. degree for all teachers.	2. Stress of academic subjects in curriculum.	2. 4 high school programs—matriculation, general, vocational, terminal.	2. Improvement of large units of administration.
3. Merit pay and master teacher schemes.	3. Reorganization of school sytem to 7-3-2/3 pattern.	3. Several high school streams in large high schools.	3. Increased opportunities for vocational education.
4. Establishment Alberta Planning Commission.	4. Additional strand in higher education—Institute of Advanced Technology.	4. Raised entrance standards for Teachers' College—move to place teacher education in University.	4. Improvement in teacher training—minimum 2 year course under university.
5. Incorporate community colleges.	5. Scholarly background for College of Education students—move to degree status for all teachers.	5. Private School Grants Commission to be established.	5. More opportunities for continuing education for adults.
6. Provincial Government to resist any steps towards a dual system.		6. Increased Provincial grants for public schools.	6. Increased Provincial expenditure on education.

Reference: F. H. Johnson, A Brief History of Canadian Education, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1968), pp. 172-176.

APPENDIX B

ORDERS-IN-COUNCIL

1. O.C. 1403/57 ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Approved and Ordered,

(Signed) JOHN J. BOWLEN

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Edmonton, Monday, September 9th, 1957.

The Executive Council has had under consideration the report of the Honourable the Minister of Education, dated August 29th, 1957, stating that:

WHEREAS in respect of the establishment of a Commission to inquire into various aspects of elementary and secondary education it is deemed desirable that the Minister of Education convene an Advisory Committee of representatives of organizations for purposes of consultation both before and after the establishment of the Commission;

THEREFORE, upon the recommendation of the Honourable the Minister of Education, the Executive Council advises that the members of the said Advisory Committee be reimbursed without production of receipts for necessary out-of-pocket expenses which shall include transportation to Edmonton, meals, hotel accommodation, taxi fares and gratuities.

(Signed) ERNEST C. MANNING

CHAIRMAN

Reference: Copy obtained from Department of Education Archives.

2. O.C. 2009/57 ROYAL COMMISSION

Approved and Ordered,

(Signed) JOHN J. BOWLEN

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Edmonton, Tuesday, December 31st, 1957.

The Executive Council has had under consideration the report of the Honourable the Minister of Education, dated December 30th, 1957, stating that:

WHEREAS under the provisions of The Public Inquiries Act, being chapter 258 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta, 1955, it is provided that where the Lieutenant Governor in Council deems it expedient and in the public interest to cause an inquiry to be made into and concerning a matter within the jurisdiction of the Legislative Assembly and that he declares by his commission to be a matter of public concern, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint one or more Commissioners to make the inquiry and to report thereon; and

WHEREAS it is deemed expedient and in the public interest that a public inquiry be made under the provisions of The Public Inquiries Act, being chapter 258 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta, 1955, by way of a comprehensive survey of the various phases of the elementary and secondary school system of the province with particular attention to programs of study and pupil achievement; and

WHEREAS the Minister of Education has constituted an Advisory

Committee consisting of representatives of a number of Alberta organizations interested in Education and has consulted with the said Advisory Committee with respect to the terms of reference of the inquiry as set forth herein; and

WHEREAS the said Advisory Committee is available for consultation from time to time by the Commissioners nominated herein, at the request of the Commissioners; and

THEREFORE, upon the recommendation of the Honourable the Minister of Education, the Executive Council advises that a COMMISSION do issue appointing DONALD CAMERON, WILMA HANSEN, IVY TAYLOR, JOHN S. CORMACK, NORMAN W. DOUGLAS, and GORDON LESLIE MOWAT, as Commissioners to conduct the said inquiry, the said Donald Cameron to be Chairman of the Commissioners, and that they be authorized and directed to study and consider the following matters:

A. The Commissioners shall study and consider the aims and objectives essential to maintain a proper and adequate educational program for pupils of the elementary and secondary schools of the Province:

B. The Commissioners, having regard to their findings relative to A, above, shall inquire into the various aspects of elementary and secondary education as they relate to the schools of Alberta; and to the extent that they deem it feasible the Commissioners shall during the course of their inquiry and without restricting their consideration of any aspects, have special regard to the following list of subjects:

(1) The curricular programs of the several school levels.

BELFAST BOND

- (a) The suitability and adequacy of the subjects offered;
- (b) The efficiency of teaching and pedagogical procedures;
- (c) The adequacy of the organization, administration and supervision of instruction;
- (d) The adequacy and availability of school textbooks and of school library services;
- (e) The feasibility and desirability of interprovincial standardization of courses and textbooks;
- (f) Aids to teaching, with special attention to films, radio and television.

(2) The attainment of school pupils and the procedures governing their classification and promotion.

- (a) The age of entrance into Grade I;
- (b) The acceleration and retardation of pupils;
- (c) The establishment of achievement norms;
- (d) The retention of pupils in school;
- (e) Departmental examinations and the extent to which these should be modified, restricted or extended;
- (f) The requirement for high school graduation, for university entrance, and for entrance into other educational institutions and training schools, including technical schools.

(3) The extent to which various special services are desirable and necessary, and the nature of those services which should be adopted as integral parts of the educational system of the Province.

- (a) Guiding and counselling;
- (b) The requirements of gifted pupils;
- (c) The requirements of handicapped pupils;
- (d) Health services;
- (e) Financial aid for high school students.

(4) Types of school organization.

- (a) Centralized schools;
- (b) Composite high schools;
- (c) The small high school in which the ratio of teachers to grades is less than one;
- (d) High school education as related to Junior Colleges;
- (e) Technical, vocational and agricultural training in high schools;
- (f) The divided school year or semester system at the high school level.

(5) Physical facilities.

- (a) The adequacy and suitability of existing facilities;
- (b) The utilization of school plant and equipment.

(6) The quality and supply of teachers.

- (a) Entrance requirements;
- (b) Facilities and programs for teacher education;
- (c) Certificates and certification requirements;
- (d) In-service education;
- (e) Factors relating to the recruitment and supply of teachers;
- (f) The distribution of teachers between urban and rural schools;

(g) Financial aid to teachers in training.

(7) The relationship of the educational system to the requirements of industry and the modern community.

(a) The growing demand for trained personnel and the provisions necessary to adequately meet the need;

(b) The impact of industrial employment opportunities on high school and university attendance;

(c) The impact of community attitudes on education;

(d) The nature of the instruction required for technical vocational training;

(e) Instruction in agriculture.

(8) The economics of education in so far as finance is a factor in respect to an appraisal of the matters enumerated above and other related subjects but exclusive of any detailed study of sources of funds for school purposes of procedures whereby such funds are obtained and distributed.

and to report thereon to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and to make such recommendations to the Lieutenant Governor in Council as the said Commissioners may in their discretion consider proper and advisable;

AND FURTHER that the said Commission do declare the said matters to be matters of public concern.

AND FURTHER that the said Commission do confer upon Donald Cameron, Wilma Hansen, Ivy Taylor, John S. Cormack, Norman W. Douglas and Gordon Leslie Mowat, the power of summoning witnesses before them and to require such witnesses

(a) to give evidence on oath, orally or in writing, or on solemn affirmation (if they are persons entitled to affirm in civil matters) and

(b) to produce such documents and things as the said Commissioners may deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to inquire,

and further conferring upon the said Commissioners the same power to enforce the attendance of witnesses and to compel them to give evidence as is vested in any court of record in civil cases.

AND FURTHER that the Commissioners may, with the prior approval and consent of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, secure consultant services, other than the Advisory Committee hereinbefore mentioned, where necessary or desirable in any phase or phases of their inquiry in either an advisory capacity or for the purpose of separate analyses to form appendices to the report of the Commission.

(Signed) ERNEST C. MANNING

CHAIRMAN

Reference: Copy obtained from Department of Education Archives.

APPENDIX C

BIOGRAPHICAL PROFILES OF COMMISSIONERS

SENATOR D. CAMERON

Birthplace: England but has lived in Alberta since 1906.

Education: One-room country school to Grade 11, B.Sc., M.Sc. University of Alberta, L.L.D. University of British Columbia.

Occupational Interests: Lecturer and Director, Dept. of Extension, University of Alberta; Director, Banff School of Fine Arts and School of Advanced Management; Member of Senate of Canada.

Other Interests: Worked with various Wheat Pools, Junior Farmers of Alberta, United Farmers of Alberta; Director, National Film Society; President, Alberta and Canadian Handicrafts Guild; Member, National Film Board of Canada; Chairman, Canadian Legion Educational Services, Alberta; Member, National Advisory Committee on Canadian Citizenship; Member, Canadian Institute of Agriculture, American Academy of Political Science, Council of Canadian Association for Adult Education, Canada Government delegation to Ninth Conf. UNESCO.

Reference: Personal Interview; The Canadian Who's Who.

MR. J. CORMACK

Birthplace: Alberta.

Education: Elementary and high school, Alberta Separate School System, B.A., L.L.B. University of Alberta.

Occupational Interests: Lawyer.

Other Interests: Secretary, Law Society; Member, Alberta Catholic Education Association; Chairman, Catholic Education Committee; Member, Canadian Catholic Council.

Reference: Personal Interview.

MR. N. DOUGLAS*

Birthplace: Ontario.

Education: Ontario.

Occupational Interests: Provincial Manager, both Thomas Eaton Company and Hudson's Bay Company.

Other Interests: Calgary Chamber of Commerce, Alberta Chambers of Commerce.

---

* Deceased, no direct information; material obtained from Commission files.

MRS. W. HANSEN

Birthplace: Alberta.

Education: Early education Fort MacLeod, B.Comm. University of Alberta, Honorary Doctorate, University of Calgary.

Occupational Interests: Secretary to Minister of Agriculture on graduation from the University.

Other Interests: Executive, Provincial and Federal levels of Home and School Association; Senates of University of Alberta and University of Calgary; Trustee, Calgary Public School Board; Executive, ASTA; Member, Alberta Educational Council, Committee on Teacher Retention and Recruitment, Big Sister Board, Family Service Bureau, Hotelman's Scholarship Board, Alberta Educational Research Association, Curriculum and Articulation Committees of Department of Education.

Reference: Personal Interview.

DR. G. MOWAT

Birthplace: Alberta.

Education: Early education in Alberta Public School system, B.Sc. University of Alberta, M.A. Brigham Young University, D.Ed. Stanford University.

Occupational Interests: Teacher, Superintendent of Schools, High School Inspector, Assistant Director of School Administration, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta (eventually Professor and Chairman of the Department).

Other Interests: Edmonton Education Society, Institute of Inspectors.

Reference: Personal Interview.

3

MRS. I. TAYLOR

Birthplace: Ireland but arrived in Alberta as an infant and lived there since that time.

Education: Public school system in Edmonton, then Camrose Normal School.

Occupational Interests: Teacher, then businesswoman.

Other Interests: Executive, FWUA, FUA; Member, Interprovincial Farm Union Council; Board Member, Alberta Federation of Agriculture, Alberta Education Committee, Alberta Library Board, Alberta Agricultural Education Committee; Board of Governors, University of Alberta; Vice-president, Alberta Council on Child and Family Welfare; and involved in many local activities in Wainwright.

Reference: Personal Interview.

APPENDIX D

I. ARCHIVAL MATERIAL CONSULTED ON THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATION IN ALBERTA, 1957-1959.

II. COMMISSION MATERIAL FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN THE ARCHIVES.

I. ARCHIVAL MATERIAL CONSULTED ON THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATION IN ALBERTA, 1957-1959

I. 1. INDEX OF MINUTES

FIRST REGULAR MEETING - December 30, 1957.

Item 1 - Submission of briefs.
Item 2 - Adoption of Minutes.
Item 3 - Sub-committee appointed.
Item 4 - Secretary and Research Director.
Item 5 - Time schedule for Research Director.
Item 6 - Legal advice.
Item 7 - Fees for Commissioners.
Item 8 - Advisory Committee.
Item 9 - Representative Nature of Commission.
Item 10 - Procedures to be followed.
Item 11 - Procedure Committee.
Item 12 - Meeting with the Minister of Education.
Item 13 - Further planning.
Item 14 - Next meeting.

SECOND REGULAR MEETING - January 29th-30th, 1958.

Item 15 - Minutes of December 30th, 1957, meeting adopted.
Item 16 - Distribution of Commission document.
Item 17 - Correspondence.
Item 18 - Ottawa Conference.
Item 19 - Submissions.
Item 20 - Reports of Committees.
Item 21 - Procedures: Operational aspects.
Item 22 - Plans for the evening meeting with Advisory Committee.
Item 23 - Lieut.-Col. Kurt Swinton.
Item 24 - Procedures: Research and terms of reference.
Item 25 - Summaries of information.
Item 26 - Time for reading, etc.
Item 27 - Television - Seattle.
Item 28 - Substitute for Research Director.
Item 29 - Clerical assistance.
Item 30 - Certification of accounts.
Item 31 - Next Meeting.
Item 32 - Adjournment.

THIRD REGULAR MEETING - February 24th-26th, 1958.

Item 33 - Minutes of Meeting January 29-30, 1958.
Item 34 - Meeting with Advisory Committee, January 29, 1958 - Editing.
Item 35 - Television - Seattle-Portland.
Item 36 - Schedule of Hearings.
Item 37 - Submission of Briefs.
Item 38 - Distribution of Briefs.
Item 39 - Schools of Agriculture - Mr. Putnam.
Item 40 - Legal Counsel.

Item 41 - Accommodation - Hotels.
Item 42 - Unfinished Business re Hearings.
Item 43 - Publicity by Commissioners.
Item 44 - Correspondence.
Item 45 - Interviews - Miss Johnston; Dr. Kephart.
Item 46 - The Budget.
Item 47 - Office files; Expense accounts.
Item 48 - Office facilities.
Item 49 - Vice-chairman appointed.
Item 50 - Education of Indians; Provision for Retarded.
Item 51 - Dr. MacArthur's Report.
Item 52 - Expenditures for Educational Travel.
Item 53 - Visits to Schools.
Item 54 - Mr. Uhlman - Research.
Item 55 - Mrs. Hansen - Aims of Education
Item 56 - Ottawa Conference.
Item 57 - History of Alberta Education.
Item 58 - Teachers - Quality and Supply.
Item 59 - Rev. G. H. Hutchinson - report.
Item 60 - Next Meeting.

FOURTH REGULAR MEETING - March 24th and 25th, 1958.

Item 61 - Minutes of Meeting, February 24th - 25th.
Item 62 - Plans for Research Studies.
Item 63 - Selection of Persons to invite to Banff.
Item 64 - Agenda for Banff.
Item 65 - The Budget.
Item 66 - Interview with Research persons.
Item 67 - Plans for writing the Report.
Item 68 - De Jour Stenorette.
Item 69 - Duplicating facilities.
Item 70 - Reservation of space for Hearings.
Item 71 - Hotel reservations.
Item 72 - Reports of Hearings.
Item 73 - Procedures for Hearings.
Item 74 - Submissions vs. Briefs.
Item 75 - Submissions requested.
Item 76 - Sources of information.
Item 77 - Visitation of Schools.
Item 78 - Reports by the Secretary.
Item 79 - Metis Children.
Item 80 - Handicapped Children.
Item 81 - Limits of the Investigation.
Item 82 - Office space.
Item 83 - Public Notices and Press Releases.
Item 84 - Competent person to act in Dr. MacArthur's absence.
Item 85 - Next Meeting.

FIFTH REGULAR MEETING - April 18th (19th and 20th), 1958.

Item 86 - Re: Summarizing of proceedings.

Item 87 - Motion re order of business.
Item 88 - Progress report on Research presented by Dr. Mowat.
Item 89 - Dr. Byrne and Mr. Steckle to be invited to Banff Conference.
Item 90 - Financial remuneration and expenses - Banff guests.
Item 91 - Re: Plans for writing the Report.
Item 92 - Transportation arrangements re Hearings.
Item 93 - Visits to Schools.
Item 94 - Office space.
Item 95 - Telecasting of Hearings.
Item 96 - Plans for Hearings.
Item 97 - Report by Mrs. Hansen.
Item 98 - Correspondence.
Item 99 - Re: Banff Conference Agenda.
Item 100 - Equipment and Supplies.
Item 101 - Next Meeting.
Item 102 - Note of Appreciation.
Item 103 - Scheduling and reviewing Briefs (Saturday, April 19th).
Item 104 - Revision of Schedule of Hearings (Sunday, April 20th).

SPECIAL MEETING - May 7th, 1958 - Marquis Hotel, Lethbridge.

Item 105 - Motion to investigate charge re downgrading of examinations, and other pertinent topics.

SPECIAL MEETING - June 13th, 1958 - Banff School of Fine Arts.

Item 106 - Re: Further Research Projects.
Item 107 - Discussions with Departmental officials to be arranged.
Item 108 - Liability and Accident Insurance.

INFORMAL MEETING - July 11th, 1958. (Some Commissioners only, present.)

SIXTH REGULAR MEETING - July 29th -30th, 1958. Lougheed Building, Calgary.

Item 109 - Adoption of Minutes.
Item 110 - Correspondence. Motions re Merit Rating.
Item 111 - Re: Textbooks.
Item 112 - Financial Statement.
Item 113 - Fees for Reading Time.
Item 114 - Research.
Item 115 - Curriculum Studies - Topics for Study.
Item 116 - Fall Hearings.
Item 117 - Liability Insurance.
Item 118 - Next regular meeting.
Item 119 - The Report.
Item 120 - Schedule of October, November, December meetings.
Item 121 - Aims of Education.
Item 122 - Dr. Millar's submission.
Item 123 - Staffing of rural schools.
Item 124 - Merit Rating.

Item 125 - School Finances.
Item 126 - Expression of Appreciation re Teacher Questionnaire.
Item 127 - C. E. A. Convention.

SEVENTH REGULAR MEETING - September 9th, 1958. (Jubilee Auditorium, Edmonton.)

Item 128 - Motion re Committee to constitute Quorum.

EIGHTH REGULAR MEETING - October 1st and 2nd, 1958.

Item 129 - Typing expenses - Dr. Hanson's work.
Item 130 - Secretarial Services.
Item 131 - Calgary Chamber of Commerce.
Item 132 - Correspondence.
Item 133 - Hours of meeting.
Item 134 - Filing cabinet.
Item 135 - Textbooks.
Item 136 - Consultants.
Item 137 - Visits to Schools.
Item 138 - Interim Report - Dr. Hanson.
Item 139 - Schedule of Hearings.
Item 140 - Letters of appreciation.
Item 141 - Agenda for Meetings.
Item 142 - Meeting with Department of Education.

NINTH REGULAR MEETING - October 28th-31st, 1958. Corral Room, Palliser Hote, Calgary.

Item 143 - Minutes of Meetings.
Item 144 - Correspondence.
Item 145 - Dr. Swift.
Item 146 - Research.
Item 147 - Consolidation of Recommendations (Mr. A. F. Brown).
Item 148 - General Discussion.
Agenda for next meeting.
Item 149 - Mr. Lindstedt.
Item 150 - Dr. Millar.

TENTH REGULAR MEETING - November 7th, 1958.

Item 151 - Merit Rating.
Item 152 - Re: Release of Reports.
Item 153 - Schedule.

ELEVENTH REGULAR MEETING - November 10th, 11th, 12th, 1958.

Item 154 - Reports of Research - Dr. Hanson and Mr. Uhlman.
Item 155 - Commission Report.
Item 156 - Further Scheduling.
Item 157 - Publication of Reports.
Item 158 - Research Funds.

Item 159 - Future contacts with British Columbia Commission.
Item 160 - Midwest Administrative Centre, University of Chicago.
Item 161 - The Aims of Education.

TWELFTH REGULAR MEETING - November 19th, 20th, 21st, 1958.

Item 162 - Correspondence.
Item 163 - Machine-room Staff.
Item 164 - Complimentary copy of Report - Mr. Evenson.
Item 165 - Dr. Rae Chittick.
Item 166 - Mr. J. P. Mitchell.
Item 167 - Terms of Reference, Section B, No. 7.

THIRTEENTH REGULAR MEETING - November 25th, 26th, 27th, 1958.

Item 168 - Public Opinion Survey.

(Discussions continued re Terms of Reference - Dr. Byrne and Mr. Mitchell present.)

FOURTEENTH REGULAR MEETING - December 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 1958.

Item 169 - British Columbia Royal Commission.
Item 170 - Schedule of Meetings.
Item 171 - Health and Personal Development Courses.
Item 172 - Superintendents of Schools.
Item 173 - Mr. R. E. Byron.
Item 174 - High School Inspectors.
Item 175 - Dr. Carl Safran - Report to Calgary School Board.
Item 176 - Merit Rating.
Item 177 - County Act.
Item 178 - Separate Schools.
Item 179 - Research.
Item 180 - Publication of Reports.
Item 181 - Trade Training and Apprenticeship Programs.

FIFTEENTH REGULAR MEETING - December 9th, 10th, 11th, 1958.

Item 182 - Health and Personal Development.
Item 183 - Dr. Rae Chittick.
Item 184 - Hutterite Schools.
Item 185 - Research Reports.
Item 186 - Elementary Education.
Item 187 - Apprenticeship and Trade Training.

SIXTEENTH REGULAR MEETING - December 16th, 17th, 18th, 1958.

Item 188 - Superintendent of Schools.
Item 189 - Consultants.
Item 190 - Elementary Education.
Item 191 - Separate Schools.
Item 192 - Further planning.

SEVENTEENTH REGULAR MEETING - January 5th, 6th, 7th, 1959 and January 8th a.m.

Item 193 - Discussion re Health and Personal Development (January 5th).
Item 194 - Health and Personal Development - Mr. Panabaker, Dr. Safran, Dr. Woodsworth.
Item 195 - Counties - Dr. A. W. Reeves.
Item 196 - Superintendent of Schools - representatives of A.S.I.A. present.
Item 197 - Superintendents' Brief.
Item 198 - Schedule of Meetings.
Item 199 - (January 8th a.m.) Four members met for purpose of consolidating information.

EIGHTEENTH REGULAR MEETING - January 20th, 21st, 22nd, 1959.

Item 200 - Terms of Reference.
Item 201 - Research.
Item 202 - Information.
Item 203 - Agenda for Meeting January 27th-30th.

NINETEENTH REGULAR MEETING - January 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 1959.

Item 204 - Banff Meeting.
Item 205 - Teacher Education. Transition Period.
Item 206 - Report of Commission.
Item 207 - Vacation.
Item 208 - Dr. Millar.
Item 209 - Superintendents' Conference.
Item 210 - Hutterite Schools.
Item 211 - Agenda.

TWENTIETH REGULAR MEETING - February 4th, 5th, 6th, 1959.

Item 212 - Dr. Clark, Columbia University - Economist, Educationalist.
Item 213 - The T. P. E. Opinionnaire.
Item 214 - Editorial Writing.
Item 215 - Interim Report.
Item 216 - Research Facilities.

TWENTY-FIRST REGULAR MEETING - February 10th, 11th, 12th, 1959.

- Educational Research.
- Separate Schools.
- Curriculum.
- Next Meetings.

TWENTY-SECOND REGULAR MEETING - February 18th and 19th, 1959.

Item 217 - Ontario Teacher Supply.
Item 218 - Research Facilities.

Item 219 - Black Report - Major Research Project No. 2.
Item 220 - MacArthur - Hunka Report.
Item 221 - Dr. Millar.
Item 222 - School Finance.
Item 223 - March Meetings.
Item 224 - Faculty interest in Commission Research.
- Discussion on Language.

TWENTY-THIRD REGULAR MEETING - February 23rd, 24th, 25th, 1959.

Item 225 - Senator Cameron's Letters.
Item 226 - Motion re Dr. Black's presentation of Report in Calgary, March 6th meeting.
Item 227 - Schedules.

TWENTY-FOURTH REGULAR MEETING - March 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th - School of Fine Arts, Banff. March 6th - Palliser Hotel, Calgary.

Item 228 - British Columbia Royal Commission.
Item 229 - Adoption of Minutes.
Item 230 - Dr. Millar.
Item 231 - IBM Cards.
Item 232 - Mr. Alan Brown.
Item 233 - Further Planning - April and May schedules.
Item 234 - Breakfast Meeting in Calgary.
Item 235 - Dr. Black's Report on Pupil Personnel Study.

TWENTY-FIFTH REGULAR MEETING - March 10th, 11th, 12th, 1959.

Item 236 - Planning:
  (a) Dr. Millar.
  (b) Dr. Black.
  (c) Other Educational Systems.
  (d) Mr. Edwards.
  (e) Curriculum News Letter.
  (f) Educational T.V.
  (g) Dr. MacArthur.
  (h) Separate Schools.
Item 237 - Correspondence:
  (a) Dr. Reeves - re $100.00 item for Research.
  (b) Mr. Chas. Campbell, Red Deer.
Item 238 - Proceedings:
  (a) T.V. Viewing.
  (b) Literature.
  (c) Arithmetic.
  (d) Specialists - Department of Education.
  (e) Dr. D. B. Black (Report continued).
  (f) Spelling.
  (g) Reconnaissance (Terms of Reference).
  (h) Curriculum - General Considerations.
  (i) Individual Differences.

TWENTY-SIXTH REGULAR MEETING - March 17th, 18th, 19th, 1959.

Item 239 - Publicity.
Item 240 - Hearing: Dr. G. J. Millar.
Item 241 - Consultants:
    (a) Dr. T. C. Byrne.
    (b) Dr. R. S. MacArthur.
Item 242 - Further Planning:
    (a) Dr. Millar.
    (b) Dr. MacArthur.
    (c) Terms of Reference.
    (d) Commission Report.

TWENTY-SEVENTH REGULAR MEETING - March 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th (a.m.).

Item 243 - Dr. Black - Report of Pupil Personnel.
Item 244 - Dr. R. Pedley.
Item 245 - Discussions.
Item 246 - Dr. R. S. MacArthur.
Item 247 - Calgary Meeting, week of April 20th, 1959.

TWENTY-EIGHTH REGULAR MEETING - April 21st to 24th, inclusive, 1959.

Item 248 - Minutes.
Item 249 - Correspondence.
Item 250 - Further Planning.
Item 251 - Discussions: Dr. H. S. Baker, April 23 (a.m.).
    Mr. A. D. McTavish, April 23.
    Dr. H. T. Coutts, April 24 (a.m.).
Item 252 - Calgary Meeting - suggested agenda.

TWENTY-NINTH REGULAR MEETING - April 28th to 30th, 1959. Palliser Hotel, Calgary.

Item 253 - Schedule of meetings.
Item 254 - Mr. Cormack expressed opinion re consultant to explain Roman Catholic point of view.
Item 255 - Secretary to write for TV interview between Arthur Godfrey and Sam Levinson.
Item 256 - Commission Report - Study of Draft.
Item 257 - Secretary to prepare statement re cost of implementing proposed teachers' salary scale.

THIRTIETH REGULAR MEETING - May 11th to 15th inclusive, 1959.

Item 258 - Correspondence.
Item 259 - Discussions - variety of topics.
Item 260 - Assignments.
Item 261 - Further Planning.

THIRTY-FIRST REGULAR MEETING - May 22nd, 1959.

Item 262 - Discussion on school finance.
Item 263 - Further planning.

THIRTY-SECOND REGULAR MEETING - May 25th to 29th inclusive, 1959.

Item 264 - Further Planning.
Item 265 - Adult Education.
Item 266 - School Finance.
Item 267 - Separate Schools.
Item 268 - Minority Report.
Item 269 - Chairmanship.

THIRTY-THIRD REGULAR MEETING - June 2nd, 3rd and 4th, 1959.

Item 270 - Dr. Black's Study - Interpretations. Motion.
Item 271 - Commission Report.

THIRTY-FOURTH REGULAR MEETING - June 8th to 11th, inclusive, 1959.

Item 272 - Correspondence.
Item 273 - Further Consultants.
Item 274 - Library Conference - Motion.
Item 275 - Calgary Agenda.
Item 276 - Development of Report.

THIRTY-FIFTH REGULAR MEETING - June 15th to 19th, inclusive, 1959.
Palliser Hotel, Calgary.

Item 277 - Correspondence.
Item 278 - Review of Progress.
Item 279 - Discussions - topics as listed.
Item 280 - Commission Report.
Copies required - assignments to Commissioners - date of completion - motion re majority and minority reports.
Item 281 - Further meetings.

THIRTY-SIXTH REGULAR MEETING - July 4th, 1959. Banff School of Fine Arts, Banff.

Item 282 - Amendment to Minutes.
Motion re Item 280 (c) June 15-19, 1959.
Item 283 - Correspondence.
Item 284 - Teacher Education.
Item 285 - Further Plans.

THIRTY-SEVENTH REGULAR MEETING - September 30th-October 1st, 1959.

Item 286 - Procedures for completing the Report.
Item 287 - Time scheduling - re Report.
Item 288 - Organization of Report.

Item 289 - Number of copies.
Item 290 - Special Studies.
Item 291 - Briefs - Disposal of.
Item 292 - Index of Briefs.
Item 293 - Financial Statement.

THIRTY-EIGHTH REGULAR MEETING - October 23rd-28th, 1959.

Item 294 - Letter Mr. Cormack (dissenting from Commission Report).
Item 295 - Letter Hon. James Smith, Yukon.
Item 296 - Report - printing of.
Item 297 - Minority Report.
Item 298 - Commission Report.
Item 299 - Dr. Baker's account.
Item 300 - Next meeting - Nov. 1 - to review Minority Report.

THIRTY-NINTH REGULAR MEETING - November 1st-3rd, 1959.

Item 301 - Minority Report (40 matters of disagreement discussed).
Item 302 - Legal opinion (on Minority Report).
Item 303 - Insert - Report.
Item 304 - Resolution of Appreciation.
Item 305 - Research Reports - disposal of.
Item 306 - Winding up.
Item 307 - Submission of Report (9th November, 1959).

Reference: Commission Files,
Department of Education
Archives.

I. 2. FILE OF CORRESPONDENCE ON INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS TO ROYAL COMMISSION

Name	Substance of Submission
Mr. E. Baker	Request to have Fairview School of Agriculture re-opened.
Mrs. M. Dixon	Deplored low Grade I requirements and non-phonetic method of teaching reading.
Mrs. B. Durling	Explained difficulties for students who transfer from province to province.
Mr. Y. Emberton	Requested single sex schools, ban on rock music on radio, appointment of monitors to schools.
Mr. J. Gilmore	Sent copies of articles on Russian education - suggested democracy in Canada in danger because education could not match that of the Russians.
Mrs. J. Graham	Wanted standardization of textbooks and subjects.
Mrs. L. Henry	Rural point of view on retaining small high schools as more effective learning environments.
Mr. H. Rhodes	Offered his thesis proposal on agricultural education for use of Commission.
Mr. C. Richardson	Criticized lack of "sentence sense" in language, curriculum content outlines in enterprise are too indefinite, wanted core of subjects in high school (P.Ed. compulsory 5 periods/week).
Seba Beach-Entwistle Sub-local ATA	Wanted many more children diverted to trade, agriculture and composite schools, against automatic promotion, indicated that ATA brief was not approved by Locals therefore was not an expression of teachers' philosophy.
Mrs. E. Sherman	Objected to Mormon religious instruction in school - other children wasted time from lessons.
Mr. G. Strong	On instruction in sign language for deaf for teachers.

Name	Substance of Submission
Mrs. C. Tyner	Plea for facilities for remedial action on poor readers early in school career.
Wainwright Centralization School Board	Suggestions for improvement: buses, hot lunch program, use of school buildings, language and literature, High School Diplomas, Community Colleges, transfer of teachers.

Reference: Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

I. 3. FILE OF SUBMISSIONS OR DISCUSSIONS HEARD IN CLOSED SESSIONS OF ROYAL COMMISSION

Date	Personnel	Topic
February 1958	Miss J. Johnstone	Reading in Primary Grades
April 26 1958	Principal - Mount Royal College	Mount Royal College
October 6 1958	Mr. White, Dr. Bentley, Mr. Birdsall, Mrs. Howse, Mr. Wood, Mr. Gault, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pugh, Mr. McHardy, Mr. Hawker, Mr. Broughton, Mr. Francis, Mr. Lien, Mr. Platt, Mr. McCalla, Mr. Deschamps, Dr. Byrne, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Longman	(i) Agriculture - Vocational Short Courses, Agriculture in High Schools
	Dr. McCallam - Health Dept. Dr. Swift - Education Dept. Mr. Putnam - Agriculture Dept. Mr. Oberholtzer - Industries and Labor Dept. Mr. McKinnon - Oil and Gas Conservation Board Dr. Sommerville - Health Dept. Dr. Bently - Faculty of Engineering Mr. Byron - Director, Vocational Education	(ii) Programs under Government Departments
October 7 1958	Dr. Bentley - Faculty of Agriculture Mr. MacHardy - Faculty of Agriculture Mr. Putnam - Deputy Minister of Agriculture Mr. Birdsall - Princ., Olds School of Agriculture Mrs. V. MacDonald Dr. Longman - (Former) Dep. Min. of Agriculture Mr. Gault - Superintendent of Schools Mr. Byron Mr. Wood - Prov. Institute of Technology & Art	Agriculture - Problems of Co-ordination - Agricultural Schools

Date	Personnel	Topic
	Dr. Byrne - Chief Superintendent of Schools Mrs. Howes - Women's Institute Mr. White - Apprenticeship Board Mr. Hawker - Supt. Schools of Agriculture Mr. Lien - President, Jun. FUA Mr. McCalla - Farmers' Union Alberta Mr. Deschamps - Agriculture Secretary Mr. Broughton - Alberta Wheat Pool Mr. Francis - United Grain Growers Mr. Moss	
October 8 1958	Articulation Committee Dr. Stewart, Dr. Johns, Dr. Coutts, Dr. Swift, Mr. Evenson, Mr. Watts, Dr. Keeping, Professor Gads, Dr. Smith, Mr. Warren, Mrs. McCullough	Matriculation Program-Problem Areas - Junior Colleges
October 9 1958	Articulation Committee	Matriculation
October 28-30 1958	Mr. White - Director, Apprenticeship Board Mr. Steckle - Principal, West. Canada High School Mr. Panabaker - Asst. Super. of Schools, Calgary Mr. Norris, Principal, Glendale School Mr. Hey - Personnel Manager, Eaton's Mr. VanTighem - Asst. Super. Calgary Sep. Schools Mr. Cannon - Supt. Calgary Sep. Schools Mr. Carlyle - Union Milk Dr. Byrne - Chief Superintendent of Schools Mr. Wood - Principal, Prov. Instit. of Technology & Art	Educational Structure

Date	Personnel	Topic
	Mr. Byron - Director of Vocational Education Dr. Hanson - Dept. of Political Economy, U. of A. Mr. Warren - Super. of Schools, Calgary Mr. Bodie - Trades & Labor Council Mr. Collett - Dean, Mt. Royal College Mr. Bishop - Personnel Officer, Bank of Montreal Mr. McArthur - Chamber of Commerce Mr. Fraser - Personnel Mgr., Western Leaseholds Ltd. Mr. Harvie - General Mgr., Western Leaseholds Ltd. Mr. Denholme - Secretary, Standard Gravel & Surfacing Ltd. Mr. Haden - Admin. Asst. to Vice President, Shell Oil Co. Mr. Middleburg - Personnel Rep., Shell Oil Co. Mr. Madsen - Chamber of Commerce	
November 3 1958	Dr. Coutts - Dean, Faculty of Education, U. of A.	(i) Bases for Establishing Teachers' Salaries (ii) Teaching of English and Social Studies
November 4-5 1958	(Personnel not given)	Professional Education
November 6-7 1958	(Personnel not given)	Semi-professional Education
February 24 1959	Dr. Coutts Dr. Buxton	Literature Grades VII-XII

Reference: Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

I. 4. SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS FOR ROYAL COMMISSION

Date		Centre	Briefs
April 1958	21-25	Edmonton	#3, #5, #6, #15, #22, #25, #26, #31, #39, #45, #47, #48, #51, #52, #70
May 1958	1-2	Edmonton	#62, #13, #66 Pt.I
	5	Red Deer	#141, #142, #143, #144, #145
	6-7	Lethbridge	#122, #119, #118, #116, #115, #124
	8-9	Medicine Hat	#133, #129, #131, #126, #128, #135, #134, #130, #132, #127
	20	Wainwright	#148, #152, #153, #150, #149
	25-30	Calgary	#100, #82, #84, #80, #89, #97, #87, #81, #101, #74, #98, #88, #99, #76
June 1958	3	Hanna	#113, #112
	4	Coronation	#106
	5	Provost	#139
	6	Wetaskiwin	#154, #156, #158, #159
	23	Grande Prairie	#111
	24	Peace River	#136
	25	High Prairie	#114
	26-27	Fairview	#108, #110, #109, #107

Date		Centre	Briefs
September 1958	2	Calgary	#96, #171, #83, #94, #86
	4	Lethbridge	#122, #119, #118, #116, #115, #124
	8-26	Edmonton	#32, #43, #19, #20, #41, #53, #14, #49, #64, #24, #177, #22, #40, #69, #7, #155, #66 Pt.II, #180, #57, #58, #59, #37, #60, #4, #63, #16, #9, #172, #65, #67, #68, #44, #27, #1, #10, #29, #36, #71, #18, #46, #30
	29	St. Paul	#147, #173
	30	Athabasca	#102, #103
October 1958	28	Calgary	#184
November 1958	3	Edmonton	#182, #186

Reference: Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

I. 5. LIST OF RESEARCH PROJECTS FOR ROYAL COMMISSION

Major Research

Researcher(s)	Subject
Andrews, J. H.	Public and Professional Opinion Regarding the Tasks of the Public Schools of Alberta.
Black, D. M.	A Longitudinal Study of the Academic Performances of a Grade IX Class over Three Consecutive Years of Senior High School.
Hanson, E. J.	Educational Finance.
Hanson, E. J. and Uhlman, H.	Population and Economic Trends in Alberta in Relation to School Needs.
Lindstedt, S. A.	The Alberta Teacher Force in 1957-1958.
MacArthur, R. S. and Hunka, S.	School Examination Practices and Standards in Alberta.
MacArthur, R. S. and Patterson, J. G.	Pupil Personnel in Alberta Schools—A Review of Studies Completed in 1958.
Uhlman, H. J.	Education Needs as Viewed by Selected Alberta Manufacturers.

Minor Research

*Researcher(s)	Subject
MacArthur, R. S.	Alberta Matriculants and their Entrance to Universities outside Alberta. [This was reported but no details were given in the MacArthur/Hunka study.]
MacArthur, R. S.	Comparative Standards: Here and There, Then and Now. [This was reported as part of the MacArthur/Hunka study.]
Rees, R. E.	Research Reports on Gifted Children, Educational Television, Mathematics Programmes, Handicapped Children and Indian Schools.

*Calgary Chamber of Commerce: Future Personnel Needs of Industry and Business. [A study of employers' occupational requirements - Commission Minutes mentioned that Dr. R. MacArthur and Mr. Hunka were responsible for presenting the study to the Commission.]

Researcher(s)	Subject
Reeves, Dr.	A Summary of the Andrews-Brown Study - The Canadian Survey of Composite High Schools. [Received at 4th Regular meeting of the Commission, 24-25 March 1958.]

Reference: Commission Files, Department of Education Archives.

I. 6. OUTLINE OF REPORT

Chapter	Focus of Chapter
1	Origin and Operation of the Commission
2	Areas of Public Concern
3	Population Trends
4	Occupational Trends
5	Financial Trends
6	Some Governing Views
7	Accreditation
8	Examinations - A Perspective
9	Examinations - Analysis and Reform
10	The Acceptability of Matriculants in Alberta and Elsewhere
11	School Organization and the Curriculum - A Perspective
12	The Curriculum and Administrative Authority
13	The Structure of the Curriculum
14	The Subject Fields
15	Special Curriculum Issues
16	Elective Programs
17	Business Education
18	Agricultural Education
19	The Community College
20	Adult Education
21	Teacher Education - A Perspective
22	The Supply of Teachers
23	The Preparation of Teachers
24	The Payment of Teachers
25	Special Personnel
26	Supporting Services
27	Special Services
28	Facilities and Equipment
29	Other Matters of Organization
30	Separate Schools
31	School Finance
32	Research in Education

Chapter	Focus of Chapter
33	The Alberta Educational Planning Commission
34	Divergent Opinion
	MINORITY REPORT
	- Progressivism or modernism
	- Essentialism or traditionalism
	- Areas of public concern
	- Population - occupational trends
	- Some governing views
	- Accreditation - Examinations - School Organization and Curriculum - Theory and Practice - The Subject Fields - Elective Programs - The Community College - Teachers - Special Personnel - Facilities and Equipment - Separate Schools - Planning Commission
	- Conclusion

Reference: Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta. Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1959.

II. COMMISSION MATERIAL FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN THE ARCHIVES

II. 7. ALBERTA ROYAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATION
NUMERICAL LIST OF BRIEFS

Number	Submitted By	Place of Origin of Hearing
1	Architects Association of Alberta	Edmonton
2	Alberta Catholic School Trustees Association	Edmonton
3	Alberta Co-operative Union	Edmonton
4	Alberta Drama Board	Edmonton
5	Alberta Federation of Agriculture	Edmonton
6	Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations	Edmonton
7	Alberta Library Association	Edmonton
8	Alberta Library Board	Edmonton
9	Alberta Motor Association	Edmonton
10	Alberta Optometric Association	Edmonton
11	Alberta Teachers Association	Edmonton
12	Alberta School Trustees Association	Edmonton
13	Association of Professional Engineers	Edmonton
14	Association of Private Schools	Edmonton
15	Association of Bilingual Educators	Edmonton
16	Bilingual School Trustees	Edmonton
17	Brown, Mrs. R. W.	Edmonton
18	Callan, Mrs. Dorothy	Edmonton
19	Canadian Association for Health, etc. - Mens Branch	Edmonton
20	Canadian Association for Health, etc. - Womens Branch	Edmonton
21	Canadian Bandmasters Association	Edmonton
22	Canadian Federation of University Women - re Libraries	Edmonton
23	Canadian Federation of University Women - re H.S. Standards	Edmonton
24	Canadian Mental Health Association	Edmonton
25	Canadian Catholic Conference of Alberta	Edmonton
26	Catholic University Alumnae Association	Edmonton
27	Co-operative Commonwealth Federation	Edmonton
28	Department of Agriculture (Alberta)	Edmonton
29	Edmonton Chamber of Commerce	Edmonton
30	Edmonton and District Council of Churches	Edmonton
31	Edmonton Home Economics Association	Edmonton
32	Edmonton Educational Study Group	Edmonton
33	Edmonton Jewish Community Council	Edmonton
34	Edmonton Public School Local, ATA	Edmonton
35	Edmonton Separate School Board	Edmonton
36	Edmonton Separate School Teachers	Edmonton
37	Edmonton Society for Christian Education	Edmonton
38	Farmers Union of Alberta	Edmonton

Number	Submitted By	Place of Origin of Hearing
39	French Canadian Association of Alberta	Edmonton
40	Garneau Home and School Association	Edmonton
41	Group of Edmonton Women	Edmonton
42	Guebert, Arnold - re Latin in High Schools	Edmonton
43	Idylwylde Home and School Association	Edmonton
44	International Council for Study of Exceptional Children	Edmonton
45	Junior Hospital League	Edmonton
46	Kiwanis Club, West Edmonton	Edmonton
47	Le College Saint-Jean	Edmonton
48	Leduc-Strathcona Health Unit	Edmonton
49	Lutheran Educators in Alberta and British Columbia	Edmonton
50	McCalla, Mrs. A. G. - re Oral Language	Edmonton
51	Parkview Home and School Association	Edmonton
52	St. Johns Home and School Association	Edmonton
53	St. Thomas Aquinas Guild	Edmonton
54	Shaw, Betty Reilly	Edmonton
55	Sherbrooke Home and School Association	Edmonton
56	Smith, L. V.	Edmonton
57	Ukrainian Canadian Committee - re Ukrainian Language	Edmonton
58	Ukrainian Catholic Council	Edmonton
59	Ukrainian Parents	Edmonton
60	Unitarian Church of Edmonton	Edmonton
61	U. of A. Department of Entymology	Edmonton
62	U. of A. Department of Mathematics	Edmonton
63	U. of A. Department of Physics	Edmonton
64	U. of A. Faculty of Agriculture	Edmonton
65	U. of A. Faculty of Arts and Science	Edmonton
66	U. of A. Faculty of Education	Edmonton
67	U. of A. Faculty of Law	Edmonton
68	U. of A. Faculty of Medicine	Edmonton
69	Virginia Park Home and School Association	Edmonton
70	Wild Life Tours	Edmonton
71	Willis, Dr. C. B.	Edmonton
72	Alberta Council on Child and Family Welfare	Calgary
73	Alberta Federation of Labour	Calgary
74	Alberta Fish and Game Association	Calgary
75	Alberta Institute of Agrologists	Calgary
76	Alberta Society of Artists	Calgary
77	Baker, J. W.	Calgary
78	Berean Bible College	Calgary
79	Calgary Chamber of Commerce	Calgary
80	Calgary City Local, ATA	Calgary
81	Calgary Home and School Council	Calgary
82	Calgary School Board	Calgary
83	Canadian Petroleum Association	Calgary
84	Central High School Students Council	Calgary
85	Dunford, H. B.	Calgary

Number	Submitted By	Place of Origin of Hearing
86	Farran, Roy - Publisher	Calgary
87	Gussow, W. A. - Geologist-Engineer	Calgary
88	High River Joint Committee	Calgary
89	High School Administrators	Calgary
90	Humanities Association of Canada	Calgary
91	Home Economics Group	Calgary
92	Indian Association of Alberta	Calgary
93	Institute of Chartered Accountants	Calgary
94	Property Owners Protective Association	Calgary
95	Ranson, Ralph - calligraphy, school grounds	Calgary
96	Representative Group of Parents	Calgary
97	Senior High School Teachers - re Social Studies	Calgary
98	Tarangle, J. G. - re Business Education	Calgary
99	Teacher Recruitment and Retention	Calgary
100	University of Alberta (Calgary) Faculty of Education	Calgary
101	University Womens Club	Calgary
102	Athabasca Home and School Association	Athabasca
103	Warren, Fred S.	Athabasca
104	Banff Home and School Association	Banff
105	Camrose Chamber of Commerce	Camrose
106	Castor Sch. Div. #27: Board of Trustees	Coronation
107	Fairview ATA Local	Fairview
108	Fairview Chamber of Commerce	Fairview
109	Fairview School of Agriculture Alumni	Fairview
110	Hines Creek Home and School Association	Fairview
111	Farmers Union of Alberta: Dist. #1	Grande Prairie
112	Berry Creek and Sullivan Lake School Divisions	Hanna
113	Prairie Grade School PTA (Three Hills)	Hanna
114	High Prairie Home and School Association	High Prairie
115	Alberta Sugar Beet Growers	Lethbridge
116	Association of Principals and Vice-Principals	Lethbridge
117	Bricker, Clayton	Lethbridge
118	Hamilton Junior High Home and School Association	Lethbridge
119	Hoyt, Martin	Lethbridge
120	Lethbridge Chamber of Commerce	Lethbridge
121	Lethbridge Junior College	Lethbridge
122	Lethbridge School District #51	Lethbridge
123	Professional Institute of Public Service	Lethbridge
124	Shields, R. L. - Principal Cardston High	Lethbridge
125	Southern Alberta Shop Teachers Association	Lethbridge
126	Canadian Federation of University Women	Medicine Hat
127	Carlson, Mrs. E.	Medicine Hat
128	Medicine Hat Chamber of Commerce	Medicine Hat

Number	Submitted By	Place of Origin of Hearing
129	Medicine Hat School District #76: Board of Trustees	Medicine Hat
130	Medicine Hat School District #76: Guidance Committee	Medicine Hat
131	Medicine Hat School Division #4	Medicine Hat
132	Medicine Hat High School Staff	Medicine Hat
133	"LLL Club" Medicine Hat High School	Medicine Hat
134	St. Louis R.C. Separate S.D. #21	Medicine Hat
135	Ralston Home and School Association	Medicine Hat
136	Berwyn Mens Club	Peace River
137	Sheehan, C. A.	Peace River
138	Czar Home and School Association	Provost
139	Hardisty-Provost Local ATA	Provost
140	Provost Home and School Association	Provost
141	Huxley Home and School Association	Red Deer
142	Lacombe and District Taxpayers Association	Red Deer
143	Red Deer Chamber of Commerce	Red Deer
144	River Glen Home and School Association	Red Deer
145	Pine Hill and Shady Nook FUA	Red Deer
146	Metz, Mrs. E. Principal South Hill School	Red Deer
147	St Paul School District #2228	St Paul
148	Buffalo Park Home and School Association	Wainwright
149	MacKenzie, David - Student	Wainwright
150	Sydenham-Gerald and Ascot Locals, ATA	Wainwright
151	Teachers of Music in Wainwright School Division	Wainwright
152	Wainwright Home and School Association	Wainwright
153	Wainwright School Div. Principals Association	Wainwright
154	Alberta Womens Institute	Wetaskiwin
155	County of Wetaskiwin	Wetaskiwin
156	Five-School Project	Wetaskiwin
157	Murray, Wilfred	Wetaskiwin
158	Owen, Dr. Francis	Wetaskiwin
159	W.C.T.U. Central Alberta	Wetaskiwin
160	Acadia ATA Local	Acadia Valley
161	Bach, Mrs. J.	Carmangay
162	McPheeters, Mrs. J.	Cayley
163	Brown, Mr. E. W.	Claresholm
164	Nidaros Evangelical Lutheran Church	Claresholm
165	St. Peters English Lutheran Church	Claresholm
166	Drumheller School Division #30	Drumheller
167	Red Deer Valley School Division #55	Drumheller
168	Islay Home and School Division	Islay
169	Spencer, J. A. - re Libraries	Magrath
170	Docherty, H. A. Principal Mannville School	Mannville
171	Rockyford Home and School Association	Rockyford
172	Phibbs, Mrs. Molly	St. Albert
173	Bielish, Mrs. Martha	Warspite

Number	Submitted By	Place of Origin of Hearing
174	Odynak, Steve Teacher	Willingdon
175	Millar, Dr. D. University of Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
176	Swystun, Wasyl - re schools of the Soviet Union	Winnipeg
177	Associated Temperance Forces of Alberta	Edmonton
178	Catholic Womens League, Diocese of Grouard	High Prairie
179	Fairview Group of Parents	Fairview
180	Department of Education	Edmonton
181	Institute of Accredited Public Accountants	Edmonton
182	The Property Owners Association of Edmonton	Edmonton
183	Chinook Consolidated School	Calgary
184	Calgary Association of Teachers of French	Calgary
185	Inter-church Committee on Protestant-Catholic Relations	Edmonton
186	Junior Farmers Union of Alberta	Edmonton
187	Alumni Association, Vermilion School of Agriculture	
188	Wainwright LPP Club	Wainwright
189	Lyon, Lieut-Col. H.	Vancouver

Reference: Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta. Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1959.

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEWS

INTERVIEWS: GROUP (A) COMMISSIONERS

NAME: Senator D. Cameron DATE: 31.7.1974

POSITION: Chairman CATEGORY: Commissioner and Professional Educator

---

BACKGROUND

Could you indicate major factors influencing attitudes to education at the time?

New approach to education - child-centered or permissive had led to dissatisfaction - the aim was to give teachers more freedom - but this requires very competent teachers. There was the problem of high schools - what was the valid outcome of a high school education? university? There was the problem of increasing costs. There was more emphasis on quality of the teaching profession. There was the problem of adopting an educational programme suitable for the individual's entry into industrial society.

Could you comment on the philosophy underlying Albertan education at the time?

Many discussions on this - no consensus. General philosophy: to develop the whole individual to his fullest capacity - to make it possible for the individual to get the most out of life. This philosophy arose out of the historical and social background of the province. (The non-conformist influence - particularly via America leading to a philosophy of "try anything once"; the periods 1880's-1930's of expansion and 1930's-1960's of consolidation - note their characteristics.) The 1950's were a time of preparation for change.

SETTING UP THE COMMISSION

Why were you selected to work on the Commission?

Own educational background - attended one room school then university. Gained a position in the Extension Department on graduation - because had been president of the junior branch of the UFA, i.e. knew farm people, had travelled extensively in the province and other parts of Canada. In the 1930's had travelled to Europe to examine education systems, especially the Scandinavian folk-high school because of felt need in Alberta for some type of continuing education after the Depression - also involvement in the Banff school.

Why did you accept the task?

Opportunity to further educational philosophy in which he was interested - need to reassess whole approach to post-secondary education with a higher percentage of people with university education - the rural dominated economy had given way - the development of a vital social consciousness in the people was needed. Senator Cameron found the prospect stimulating.

Can you suggest why a royal commission on education should have been set up just at that time?

Middle 30s and 40s - introduction of progressive education - idea not new to Trustees, Farm Women, H. and S. associations - all had been trying to find a panacea for education - much discussion at their conventions. Also had a strong Faculty of Education - there was a dynamic in Alberta not found in the other provinces. Perren Baker had developed the slogan "Grade 8 for all" in the 1920s; 1930s new slogan "Grade 11 for every child"; by the 1940s "Opportunity for secondary education and university for all" represented great changes which coincided with change from rural to industrial society. The Royal Commission was a "popular form" and a valuable means by which the people could express their views.

What was the Commission's main purpose?

According to the terms of reference but as well Cameron and Hansen were very interested in the concept of continuing education.

What was the Commission's main task?

To get the views of the people and to ensure the objective view by using research.

Were there any groups or individuals opposed to the setting up of the Commission?

Some backlash because of large unit administration - but the feeling was diffuse and a minority view.

Were you satisfied with the terms of reference?

Yes, except for the topic of continuing education.

Were you satisfied with the membership of the Commission?

Yes - was a representative body.

OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

Did you feel you were tapping public and other opinion adequately?

Yes - an example of the democratic process in action.

How satisfactory was the operation of the Commission at the time?

Yes - because was needed so that Commission would not get out of step with the climate of the times. No - because of the assessment problem - own prejudices may carry undue weight. The Roman Catholic viewpoint definitely opposed to the general view - clash of ideologies - strong Catholic lobby - Commission tried to reconcile both views. The French question was less pressing.

Were you hindered in your task in any way?

No - good co-operation everywhere.

Did you feel that any sections of the province did not have their opinion heard?

No.

RECOMMENDATIONS

What criteria of selection/rejection were used?

Consensus of what was people's capacity to pay i.e. feasibility - and both short and long term orientations.

Which submissions were of most value?

No outstanding challenges to the Commission - many sound briefs from organizations - Commission and its work received a remarkable degree of acceptance - no serious antagonisms.

COMMISSION REPORT

What part did you play in writing the report?

Both writing and discussion.

Were you satisfied with the manner of reporting?

Yes - wanted to get the job finished - if dragged on then would lose sense of urgency. Wanted a comprehensive report and to include the idea that there should be some continuation of the re-assessment.

What was your reaction to the presentation of a Minority Report?
What was the influence of this report on people's attitudes?
What was your reaction to the favourable press comment on the report?

Cormack not a strong member of the Commission - might have been better if had had a person who was more knowledgeable in education. The input he gave tended to be second-order, i.e. a reflection of the Church's attitude. Therefore there was little real dialogue on the matter. Cameron was not surprised that there was to be a minority report. Six months would not have made any difference to the outcome nor would greater attendance of Mr. Cormack - the individual was the weak link - the report was the voice of the Church.

Do you think the minority report had any effect at all?

The Roman Catholic sector had the satisfaction of having given their views and received extensive publicity.

Do you think that the Commission's report directly influenced subsequent educational change or merely anticipated changes which would have occurred anyway?

Both - accelerated change in certain areas and confirmed certain trends.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Did the Commission predict reactions of organized groups?

Recognised the self-interest of groups, e.g. ATA - tried to interpret their input in terms of the overall input, therefore not detrimental to the less powerful views.

What were the reactions?
Did you get much feedback?
Were you happy with the reaction?

Lot of feedback mostly supportive - if not, tried to gauge whether the comment was representative or merely a reflection of a vocal minority. In general feedback was good.

Can you recall any significant details of implementation?

With respect to raising teacher quality - over the large units of administration, evaluation of education in a rapidly changing world much be continuous - these ideas came to be accepted.

Were you aware of improvement in education subsequent to the Commission?

Yes - in teacher education.

Did any features of Albertan education remain a source of concern for you?

Need for facilities in continuing education - both at the regular school system and in other institutions - but at the time and convenience of the consumer. Wanted innovation and flexibility.

SUMMATION:

What do you see as favourable aspects of the Commission?

Tapping of public opinion.

Can you list any criticisms?

Reassessment constantly needed and perhaps royal commission format doesn't lend itself to this.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta been by the 1959 Commission?

Still influenced - Cameron surprised at the number of times reference is made to it even now.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning?

Saw it as following-on from the Cameron Commission - another evaluation 10 years later. Note: Albertans are conditioned to react to impact of the elements and lack of control of world markets - should consider this in assessing swing of public opinion, apparent Conservative/radical paradox.

Sees Cameron Commission as pragmatic or realistic and in this sense is perhaps conservative; but keep in mind also the different structure and functions of the two commissions when comparing them. Concerns of 16 years ago may not be valid now.

Additional Comment:

A useful exercise now for provincial and federal governments would be to initiate studies on the impact of technological change on societal institutions. This is something important for the 1970s.

NAME: Mr. J. Cormack DATE: Friday, June 24, 1974

POSITION: Lawyer CATEGORY: Commissioner

BACKGROUND: Biographical

Where were you born?

Alberta.

Where did you grow up?

Alberta.

Did you receive your education in Alberta?

All education in Alberta Separate School System and University of Alberta - Arts and Law.

Did you have children in school or other formal education in 1957?

Elementary and secondary schools - four girls and one boy.

Were you a member of any professional associations or groups then?

Alberta Law Society - Secretary. Also active in separate school system - Chairman of Alberta Catholic Education Association (as consultant on points of law); Catholic Education Committee advising Catholic bishops on education; Representative on Canadian Catholic Council (layman appointed by bishop to serve on a national committee).

Were you involved in the Advisory Committee on Education set up in September 1957, prior to the Commission? If so, could you tell me of its work?

No.

BACKGROUND: Educational Attitudes

Could you indicate the factors which were prominent in your thinking on education at the time of the Commission?

Concerned parent - experience of giving own children a proper education in the separate school system. Was a product of a traditional system, considered it excellent, wanted an educational system such that the parents do not lose control of the moral education of their children; school should see that parents have major rights in the education of their children. Catholic education is essential for Catholics.

Could you briefly describe your own philosophy of education; or what you see as a desirable philosophy of education?

Confused initially in the Commission because was subjected to educational theory in jargon terms, made no sense, ideologically narrow; thought they looked at aims and objectives of education but not philosophy; he is anti-progressive, all other commissioners seemed to share one philosophy influenced by Deweyism. Cormack asked the Commission to spend six more months discussing philosophies, might have come to some consensus but not accepted. Essentialism - traditional, academic. Because of large unit organization, people had been locked out, the experts took over. In the Albertan system of the time, saw alienation of parents (e.g. because of the system of guidance) and peer group pressure fostered by the education system which encouraged group dynamics; this has led to chaos. (Reasons: centralization, specialization and increased complexity of schools, school administration - experts taking over, theoretical approach of Faculty of Education was poor training for teachers - lack of parental involvement and lack of mental disciplines for students.)

SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Why were you selected to work on the Commission?

Cormack understood that Manning and the Executive Council felt it appropriate that a Separate School adherent should be on the commission and that he was named after having been suggested to Colborne by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Calgary.

Why did you accept the task?

Concerned parent, Separate School question, Bishop of Calgary had suggested him.

What was your particular contribution?

Cormack wanted to sit on the Commission not so much as a Catholic but rather as a concerned parent - his contribution was the Minority Report.

Can you suggest why a royal commission on education should have been set up just at that time?

Seemed to come out of the blue as far as the public were concerned; unrest among trustees and a little from parents; Government wanted to embark on new schemes; Commission was a trial balloon.

What did you understand to be the Commission's main task?

To examine all education within the terms of reference.

What of its main purpose? (Would you differentiate these?)

Says purpose and task synonymous.

Do you know of any group or individuals who were opposed to the setting up of the Commission?

While Cormack does not know of any opposition to a Commission it is a reasonable inference that educators and public servants did not request it. It is also a reasonable inference that any pressures that had impelled the Government to move came from alienated parents.

If you had been given the job of initiating an investigation into Alberta education in the 1950s, what form would it have taken?

Cormack is of the opinion that a royal commission is a sound idea provided that it is not formed to fly a government balloon and that it is fully representative of the areas to be explored. This need not be representation on the Commission itself so long as all the areas involved have a full and complete opportunity to make their representation. This Commission by its terms of reference and the procedure of inviting briefs and holding hearings had the external appearance of being a proper set-up. However the fact that 140 of its final recommendations were already in operation by the Department and the reluctance to examine opposing philosophies of education, still to this day remains a puzzle to Cormack,

Were you satisfied with the terms of reference?

Terms of reference okay but interpretation too narrow by the Commission.

Were you satisfied with the membership of the Commission?

No, wanted representation from independent educators, i.e. not committed to one large system. Also Trustees representative of municipal/small districts, would have been helpful.

OPERATION

How did the Commission decide on its mode of operation?

Cameron, Mowat, Rees laid out the methods of procedure. Areas of concern were taken by various members especially Mowat and Hansen and drafts were prepared. Drafts were submitted to Commission, at least three were required before the Report was prepared (this occurred once the briefs were in). Cormack went out on a limb running a law practice at the time, therefore was happy to let the others do these jobs.

What part did you play in carrying out its work?

All commissioners read briefs and attended meetings - Cormack let the others do a lot of the work.

Did you feel that you were tapping public opinion adequately?

Tapped opinion but much of it disregarded, seemed to decide on the trends in advance.

How satisfactory was the operation at the time?

Okay.

Were you hindered in your task in any way?

No.

Did you feel that there were any sections of the province: areas, groups, individuals, whose opinion was important but it did not reach you?

No, response was good, province was covered.

RECOMMENDATIONS

How did you deal with the large number of recommendations? What criteria of selection/rejection were used?

Having received many briefs and heard many representations Cormack assumed that the recommendations as well as objections posed by those heard would be dealt with individually and accepted or rejected for reasons to be discussed and agreed on by the Commission members. Instead those delegated to prepare a draft of a portion of the ultimate report merely set out ideas therein. Whether they were their own ideas or gleaned from the briefs and hearings was never clear. It is true that regard was had to various research projects undertaken for the Commission but there still remained an area in which complaints (public) and recommendations were not related to the final decisions. This is what suggested to Cormack that perhaps differing philosophies of education were competing and that there seemed to be a trend on the part of educators to prefer one to the exclusion of others. This, to Cormack, had no place in a pluralistic society.

Which submissions were of most value in deciding on recommendations: briefs, individual comments, expert reports, others?

Not applicable - decided in advance.

MINORITY REPORT

What part did you play in compiling the majority report?

Did not assist in this matter.

Overall, were you satisfied with the method of reporting?

Confused, disagreed with philosophy.

What led you to dissociate yourself from the majority report?
What preparation went into the minority report?
What did you hope to achieve?
What did you achieve in both tangible and intangible terms?
A number of editorials in the Edmonton Journal were very favourable towards the minority report. What was your reaction to this?

School merely an agent of the parents and school should be responsible to the parents. Cormack hoped that ideas would alert the public but did not expect anything to come of it.

Do you think the presence of the minority report influenced people in their acceptance/rejection of the changes the Commission wished to have made to improve education in Alberta?

Sees evidence of his ideas being resurrected today, e.g. disillusioned in separate school system in later years - this system no different from public system - Government dominating curriculum and teacher education - against Catholic system; public and separate school systems locked into a monolithic structure. Cormack wants a competitive system - separate and public schools to have grants of money associated with children not schools so that schools compete for clients (children).

Do you think the Commission's report directly influenced subsequent educational change or merely anticipated changes which would have occurred anyway?

The latter - legitimated what the Government was doing anyway, e.g. Community colleges, regional high schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Anti-vocational schools (later changed his mind because of ways of dealing with vocational education in schools had been improved.)

What reaction to the Report did you expect from the following: Government, Department of Education, ATA, ASTA, other organizations. What, in fact, were the reactions?

No comments.

How were you made aware of the reactions: officially, e.g. Minister of Education; or unofficially, by newspaper reports?

No feedback, had to read papers, attend citizen meetings.

Were you happy with the reaction?

No comment.

Can you recall any details of the implementation?

Was sick of the report by the time it went in; Cormack did not lose interest but felt that he had been playing against a stacked deck.

Were you aware of an improvement in education in Alberta subsequent to the Commission?

No.

Would you attribute changes to the Commission.

No.

Did any features of Alberta' education remain a source of concern for you?

Progressivism and teacher education.

I noted in newspaper reports of the time that the Commissioners seemed to be present at a number of meetings discussing the report for some time after it was presented. Were you involved in this activity? Was it expected?

Invited to some - but voluntary at that stage.

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

Good method to tap opinion.

Can you list any definite criticisms?

Depends on whether terms of reference are rigged and the makeup of the commissioners.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta been by the 1959 Commission?

Continued in the same way - little influence for change.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning? (Do you think it was necessary? Why did it arise? Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon? Did you contribute to this Commission? Would you say there was much difference between the 1959 and 1969 investigations? What did the 1969 Commission accomplish? Which did you think had the greater impact?)

> It was set up as a trial balloon for the Government. The reason for one commissioner was to avoid dissent; Government wanted to play a pre-determined tune.

NAME: Mrs. Wilma Hansen, B.Comm, U. of A.; D.U.C., U. of Calgary.

DATE: Thursday, June 6, 1974

CATEGORY: Commissioner

POSITION: Housewife, very involved in public service activities

---

BACKGROUND

With regard to your public service - I have found references to your work with: the Home and School Association (Provincial and National), the Senates of the Universities of Alberta and Calgary, the Teacher Recruitment Committee of the Department of Education and the Alberta Educational Council. Are there other groups or organizations with which you have been associated?

> Big Sister Board, Family Service Bureau, Sunday School Work, C.G.I.T., Wood's Christian Home Board, Hotelman's Scholarship Board, Alberta Educational Research Association, assisted in First Report 1955. Curriculum Committees of Department of Education, Articulation Committee between University and Department.
>
> (Travelled every part of province with Home and School work.)
>
> Member of 1st Canadian Conference on Education - Ottawa (1958), Second Canadian Conference on Education - Montreal (1962); Chairman of section Canadian Conference on Family in Ottawa (Canada wide, led to setting up of Vanier Institute), Calgary Public School Board, later Calgary Board of Education (1961-1967).

Were you a member of the Advisory Committee on Education established by the Minister in September 1957 prior to the Commission? If so, could you tell me a little of its work?

> No.

ATTITUDES

Could you indicate the major factors which were prominent in your thinking on education at the time of the Commission?

> Great deal of discussion and dissatisfaction among parents over education, e.g. especially with Health and Personal Development course; lack of emphasis on 3 R's, inaccuracies in health programme; element of change with a veering away from straight academic education and thus a growing demand for vocational education. There was dissatisfaction among the business community with 3 R's not being taught adequately to the greater numbers of students proceeding through high school. (Many were not up to expected standard.)

Could you briefly describe your perception of the philosophy(ies) underlying Albertan education at the time of the Commission?

There was current the progressivist idea that problem-solving—not straight rote learning should be of major importance. Dewey did have some influence.

(Says Cormack wrong - his views reflected those of his brother and the Catholic church, not those of most parents. His attendance at meetings of the Commission was poor, particularly so during the period of consolidation of recommendations. Father Kinderwater of the Separate Schools attended every public hearing.)

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Why were you selected to work on the Commission?

Because of breadth of background, particularly Home and School involvement. Minister rang to ask her.

Why did you accept the task?

Had some hesitation but Home and School Association wanted strong representation.

What was your particular contribution?

Grass-roots view of urban population (to complement function of Mrs. Taylor).

Can you suggest why a royal commission on education should have been set up just at that time?

Early 30s progressivist ideas introduced, e.g. social studies, working in groups; however, there was a legacy up to 50s of teachers not trained in this field - feeling of lack of discipline - change of pattern not understood. Parents resented this; population explosion shown particularly in post-grade IX - aspirations, abilities very heterogeneous. Expressed fear that Grade XII standard not accepted outside Alberta, particularly for entrance to out of province universities.

What did you understand to be the Commission's main task?

Total analysis of existing curriculum.

What of its main purpose? (Would you differentiate these?)

To overcome current dissatisfactions, to determine by investigation whether the many fears of parents were well founded or not; to cope with Sputnik influence, to try to look at a period of change systematically.

(Not future-oriented as was Worth Commission).

Do you know of any groups or individuals who were opposed to the setting up of the Commission?

No.

If you had been given the job of initiating an investigation into Alberta education in the 1950s, what form would it have taken?

Royal Commission - in vogue at that time. (If University or ATA had been asked to investigate, these would have been suspect.)

Were you satisfied with the terms of reference?

Felt that finance should have been included.

Were you satisfied with the membership of the Commission?

Business could have had more representation. Mr. Douglas was not familiar with educational matters. Cormack: absences hindered Commission's work; he reserved his views for the minority report therefore did not contribute as much as he could, or should have, to the discussion at Commission meetings.

(Douglas: hardly attended Commission after his accident.)

Teachers could have been represented. Mrs. Hansen wrote to Minister near beginning of Commission, wanted a practising teacher on the Commission but suggestion not acceded to.

CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

How did the Commission decide on its mode of operation?

Done in committee: public were to be brought in, required notices in papers asking for briefs, commissioning of research studies, contact with individuals, e.g. specialists in their fields, contact with other Commissions.

(Rees - excellent secretary, wrote lot of Report, brought forward materials.)

Commissioners brought in materials from own reading, also Brown helped with these matters.

What part did you play in carrying out its work?

Attendance at hearings, reading, each commissioner had special interest (e.g. Mrs. Hansen's interests: audiovisual, elementary education, education of Indian people, television).

Did you feel you were tapping public and other opinion adequately?

Yes.

(Teachers' brief outstanding.)

How satisfactory was the operation at the time?

Quite satisfactory.

Were you hindered in your task in any way?

Only in so far as reluctance on part of some of Department people to express freely what they thought. (They didn't want to jeopardize their positions.)

N.B. Superintendents gave a lot of information in confidence.

Do you feel there were any sections of the province: areas, groups, individuals, whose opinion was important but it did not reach you?

Hutterites.

(Cameron handled hearings well - friendly atmosphere.)

CONCERNING THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

How did you deal with the large number of possible recommendations?

Dr. Rees put 5,000 original recommendations into categories. Commissioners formulated their own recommendations in committee.

Overall, were you satisfied with the method of reporting?

Some suggestions were impossible, impractical, e.g. School trustees on emergency teacher training. These were rejected.

Which submissions were of most value in deciding on recommendations: briefs, individual comments, expert reports, others?

All of them, but ATA briefs were outstanding.

(Recommendations were drafted in a form suitable for implementation.)

CONCERNING THE COMMISSION'S REPORT

What part did you play in compiling the Report?

Audiovisual section draft (T.V. - radio) - for committee - worked on others also but couldn't remember which ones.

Overall, were you satisfied with the method of reporting?

Consider now that interim reports would have been useful to prepare public but at the time was satisfied with one large report. This report should have been printed for wide distribution before being made public. Instead, only the Minister of Education and the press had copies. The press tended to select items in the report which were of special interest to them. Frequently they were lifted out of context. As the public received the recommendations this way, they did not have full understanding of why recommendations were made, nor the extent to which they would affect the current curriculum. This was a big mistake. It required endless meetings, newspaper articles, correspondence to correct inaccurate interpretations.

What was your reaction to the presentation of the Minority Report in addition to the Main Report?

Thought that Cormack didn't have the right to present a Minority Report as he did. He missed many meetings, didn't hear discussion and so didn't assist in modifying or clarifying major Report recommendations. He brought the Minority Report to the Commission during the last week of meetings - too late for other Commission members to incorporate ideas acceptable to them in Majority Report.

(Realizes that Cormack had a law practice to run at same time.)

Do you think the presence of a Minority Report influenced people in their acceptance/rejection of the changes the Commission wished to have made to improve education in Alberta?

Maybe. Too bad that the only Catholic member made the Minority Report, because Catholic groups read it only and not Majority Report so were ill informed of Commisioners' work.

Some of the press comment was very favourable to the Minority Report. What was your reaction to that?

Publication of Report botched. Public and press did not have printed copies until later. Commission were pressed at end by the Minister to get the Report in. At initial press conference therefore press were not familiar with Report - some time before came out. Reactions therefore unfavourable but note Calgary Herald was totally opposed to progressive education anyway and thus favored Minority Report; this paper resented Commission's support of elementary education as it was and picked on small issues.

Evident that editor and reporters didn't read whole Report, misinterpreted recommendations, e.g. Health and personal development.

(Herald and Basil Deane were reponsible for holding back a lot of the recommendations by publicity given to issues and possible swaying of public opinion, e.g. support of Neatby.) (Mrs. Hansen phoned Neatby and found that she had only read newspaper clippings as the basis for her criticisms, had not read the Report.)

Do you think the Minority Report had any effect at all?

Didn't seem to do anything.

Do you think the Commission's Report directly influenced subsequent educational change or merely anticipated changes which would have occurred anyway?

Anticipated some changes which would have occurred anyway, e.g. accelerated developments in science and vocational education.

Example of actual innovation: community colleges - upgraded agricultural colleges. Commission won over school trustees for changes in teacher education and payment of teachers. Stimulated people to think more about education.

(However some recommendations were ignored. e.g. Educational Planning Commission [Innovation] (proved by setting up Worth Commission); serious defect, research in education not encouraged (Anticipation).

CONCERNING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

What reaction to the Report did you expect from the following: Government, Department of Education, the ATA, ASTA, other organizations, other influential individuals, Albertans generally?

Commission didn't attempt to foresee any reactions as it did its work.

What, in fact, were the reactions?

Mrs. Hansen recalls two which affected her: the discouragement of the period two weeks after first editorial in Herald which publically repudiated the Report and the comments of the Minister in one talk that discussion of aims and objectives were lacking in the Report which was not so. It appeared that the Minister had not fully understood the Report.

How were you made aware of the reactions: officially, e.g. Minister of Education, or unofficially, e.g. newspaper reports?

No official feedback, followed reactions in press.

Were you happy with this reaction?

People receptive to talks Mrs. Hansen gave at various groups (even Catholic groups). The feeling (e.g. from Herald) that the Commission's recommendations hadn't gone far enough showed that Herald didn't grasp intent of Report. e.g. Teachers vehicle for bringing in change. Mrs. Hansen annoyed about this. Home and School Association did excellent study on Report (also Worth Report).

Overall impression: very slow implementation.

Can you recall any details of the implementation?

Did the Government or Department of Education act expeditiously?

No.

Did many of the recommendations require government approval?

Not many.

Could many of the recommendations be brought in by the Department acting on its own initiative.

Yes.

Do you feel that any of the recommendations were ignored or discarded by the authorities. If so can you suggest why?

Slow implementation. (Felt this was because Minister glad not to have a condemnatory Report, wanted to "close the books" on it - shelve it somewhat. Minister was not an especially strong figure in Legislature.)

Minister said some recommendations too costly, i.e. research, Planning Commission.

Were you aware of an improvement in education in Alberta subsequent to the Commission?

Felt that couldn't see much improvement, e.g. authorities didn't exploit T.V., was some upgrading, e.g. science and maths; with hindsight, now regrets lack of attention to elementary education.

Would you attribute this to the Commission alone?

No answer.

Did any of the features of Alberta's education remain a source of concern for you?

Audiovisual potential not explored, more investigation of elementary education needed. Basics - 3 R's and expression and communication poor (STILL).

I noted in newspaper reports of the time that the Commissioners seemed to be present at a number of meetings discussing the Report, (for some time after it was presented). Were you involved in this activity? Was it expected? Did you see it as a way to explain or defend the Report?

Voluntarily accepted invitations to speak at groups. Saw this as a means of interpreting the Report to the people.

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

Tapping province-wide opinion.

Particular recommendations, e.g. Planning Commission, stress on research, guidance and counselling, criteria for selecting teacher trainees, idea of internship.

Can you list any definite criticisms?

Constant pressure from Minister to get Report finished.

Extra six months would have been a good idea because there was an extremely limited time to discuss the Minority Report and it could therefore not be done thoroughly.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta been by the 1959 Commission?

In areas of vocational education and community colleges was greatest influence.

Encouraged some deeper look at guidance and social studies - something done about this.

If had looked harder at aim to "develop initiative, critical thinking and the ability to be self-directing" this would have induced much more beneficial change.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning:

Do you think it was necessary?

Maybe.

Why did it arise?

Many changes in education on the horizon.

Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon?

Yes.

Did you contribute to this Commission?

Only in submission on Family Life Education by Family Life Council of Calgary.

Would you say that there was much difference between the 1959 and 1969 investigations?

Yes. 1959 was review of existing with recommendations for improvement. 1969 was future oriented.

What did the 1969 Commission accomplish?

?

Which do you think had the greater impact?

?

Ideas developed more in 60s: move away from traditional academic education - more acceptance of heterogeneous abilities, e.g. retarded, average, vocational.

Mrs. Hansen didn't see the need for Worth Commission - surprised - felt there was much greater demand for Cameron Commission from

C

public - doesn't think this of Worth Commission. Objected to Worth Commission's composition because lacked women appointees.

(Worth said in a letter replying to Mrs. Hansen that there were few women in the Province with education to the level to fit in with his Commission.)

She did not see Worth Commission as very different from Cameron Commission.

ADDITIONS AT END OF INTERVIEW

Recommendation on tests prior to High School Diploma being granted, e.g. communication and mathematics - not done.

Libraries: one of Mrs. Hansen's interests.

Regional accreditation (Has gone through, 1963: tied accreditation to finance and Calgary Public School Board, then couldn't afford it).

Degrees for teachers only coming in now.

Strong interest in Indian education.

Too many students have access to University - University function diluted by this.

NAME: Dr. G. Mowat DATE: June 16, 1974 9:30 a.m.

POSITION: Professor, Faculty of Education CATEGORY: Commissioner and Professional Educator

---

BACKGROUND

Were you a member of professional associations then? (I am interested in the influence of the Edmonton Education Society, especially.)

Edmonton Education Society - but no direct influence on Commission.

Were you involved in the Advisory Committee on Education established in September of 1957, prior to the Commission? If so, could you tell me of its work? e.g. Did the Commissioners consult with it during the course of their investigation? How directly was it concerned with setting out the terms of reference.

No - doesn't recall it.

ATTITUDES

Could you indicate the factors which were predominant in educational thinking at the time of the Commission?

Period of heavy unrest in public education in 1950s - expressed in speeches and writings of people, e.g. Hardy, Neatby - attacking progressive education. For Mowat - his concern was: public school system under attack - were charges justified?

Could you briefly describe your perception of the philosophy(ies) underlying Albertan education at the time of the Commission?

Sensed counter philosophies, would Alberta's philosophy be considered that of the Department of Education - can this be assumed? In post-war decade - emphasis on humanizing education - "whole child" - his worth and dignity important - school was not a mill but a place where individual could meet some adjustment "to make himself what he could" - e.g. new approaches to discipline, less emphasis on traditional aspects such as drill and more on reason.

Public at large in two camps - (1) some embraced new humanistic feelings - in so far as they understood it, (2) particularly Roman Catholic hierarchy - wanted a return or retention of rigour and discipline. But also, there was a climate of uncertainty - the difficulty for parents of reconciling what they got from school and what their children were receiving.

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Why were you selected to work on the Commission?

Had been superintendent and High School Inspector both Calgary and Edmonton - had good relationships with ATA and Trustees - had interest in finance, an area with not many others in it - was a politically sound choice - he was acceptable, had acknowledged expertise as a professional educator.

Why did you accept the task?

Thought it would be a rewarding and exciting experience - on reduced salary from University - still carried one class and worked with graduate students - did get students involved in work at University which also benefitted the Commission.

What was your particular contribution?

Vice-chairman - acted as chairman many times - was the only full-time member with background in education to assist other Commissioners - other role: to make input based on his educational knowledge and experience.

Can you suggest why a royal commission on education should have been set up just at that time?

Device to try to react to massive, that is, volume of prolonged attack on public education.

This was the view held by professional educators.

What did you understand to be the Commission's main task?

To accomplish these: used a secretariat - e.g. competent secretary Bob Rees - prepared schedule of hearings for approval of Commission.

Set up information input, e.g. commissioned studies; called in witnesses.

(Difference here more established by practice than by dialogue round the table.)

What was its main purpose?

To find out what "people" were worried about - hence briefs and hearings, etc.

Assess and apply corrective suggestions where justified.

Commission always felt that Government was not pulling a political game on them - they felt they could do something for education.

Do you know of any groups or individuals who were opposed to the setting up of the Commission?

No.

If you had been given the job of initiating an investigation into Alberta education in the 1950s, what form would it have taken?

Royal Commission - had high visibility to public - gave them real and apparent opportunity to speak out about educational concerns.

Were you satisfied with the terms of reference?

Yes.

Were you satisfied with the membership of the Commission?

Yes, small size workable, representation of societal groups adequate.

How was the research director chosen? And how were the particular research projects decided upon?

Research Director chosen on recommendation of Rees and Mowat who acted as small executive committee - discussed how research was to be done. Projects: during first six months of Commission projects emerged as recognition of need to get reliable information and test some of the evolving propositions. e.g. Criticism of over-centralization - doubts of relationship of size of schools and learning performance.

Lay members on Commission going in circles, over great maze of complaints - study set up to clarify these. To find solutions the lay Commissioners readily went back to educators - no query except for Cormack.

(Initial hostility to educators experienced within Commission was gradually dissipated.)

CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

How did the Commission decide on its mode of operation?

Lay members more keen on first priority in planning: to find out what people thought, therefore briefs, hearings, decentralization of Commission - calling witnesses - i.e. Public Context and letters and briefs received.

Employed assistant to secretary as they got to stage of trying to manage great mass of information input.

N.B. Rees and Brown did index on briefs, and categorised them.

Then called in consultants or witnesses - this led to more research.

(Witnesses were qualified to speak on particular issues.)

What part did you play in carrying out its work?

As indicated under the question "What was your particular contribution?" (page 345).

Did you feel you were tapping public and other opinion adequately?

Yes.

How satisfactory was the operation at the time?

Good.

Were you hindered in your task in any way?

No - no Government hindrance - Senator Cameron was liaison with Government - gave progress reports - quite a lot of pressure near the end to get the report finished and in.

Did you feel there were any sections of the province: areas, groups, individuals, whose opinion was important but it did not reach you?

No.

CONCERNING THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

How did you deal with the large number of possible recommendations?

This was the most difficult phase. Mowat played prominent part.

(No one external to Commission drafted report - only got someone to edit for literary style.)

Cameron, Hansen and Taylor assisted greatly in writing, not Douglas - and not Cormack - who was not there - was developing Minority Report.

What criteria of selection/rejection were used?

Criteria: based on knowledge, opinions and values developed by Commissioners through the whole process.

Which submissions were of most value in deciding on recommendations: briefs, individual comments, expert reports, others?

Large group reports and briefs of associations and professional groups - not only of educators - much more important than opinions of individuals. The former were very useful as working documents - referred to frequently.

Form of recommendations - is form for influencing policy-makers? Was Commission thinking of recommendations for planning or policy-making?

Directed toward policy-making - that is, policy of Government with respect to its role compared with that of local authorities, Department of Education with respect to exams and standards - policy of Government in expansion of education system, e.g. community college development.

Great concern with equality of educational opportunity - and granting more discretion to district and school level of education.

By intent: report failed to specify who to do what - This was the impact of "hurry-up" from Government - no further reorganization permitted with time constraints. Commission saw its Report as a discussion document.

CONCERNING THE COMMISSION'S REPORT

What part did you play in compiling the Report?

Wrote great deal of it.

Overall, where you satisfied with the method of reporting?

Yes, although wanted a final reworking - too rushed - by request of Minister.

What was your reaction to the presentation of the Minority Report in addition to the Main Report?

Do you think the presence of a Minority Report influenced people in their acceptance/rejection of the changes the Commission wished to have made to improve education in Alberta?

Some of the press comments were very favourable to the Minority Report. What was your reaction to that?

Do you think the Minority Report had any effect at all?

Minority Report got more publicity because met needs of critical press - reviewed or kept criticisms of progressive educators in plain sight.

Mowat felt badly that there was need for a Minority Report - because thought Separate School spokesmen and system viewpoint could have been accommodated within Majority Report - felt this during Commission - not at end - chance was lost - Cormack would not discuss.

Minority Report didn't affect impact of Majority Report in the long run because within the Public School System was a strong consensus on values and tasks of public education.

Minority Report might have helped separate schools in the long run because it highlighted their difficulties over the centralization issue.

Do you think the Commission's Report directly influenced subsequent educational change or merely anticipated changes which would have occurred anyway?

A combination of both of these - but would not attempt to assign cause and effect in this situation. e.g. Undoubtedly idea of community colleges was in the air and the Commission said - "let's get on and get something done."

CONCERNING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

What reaction to the Report did you expect from the following: Government, Department of Education, the ATA, ASTA, other organizations, other influential individuals, Albertans generally?

Commission was aware of possible effects - thought quite a bit of this - one result: Commission avoided being too specific in recommendations, e.g. over procedures for implementation/assigning responsibility for action - i.e. didn't view its document as a planning one - but a discussion paper.

What, in fact, were the reactions?

Different groups reacted to different sections and in different ways, e.g. ATA and ASTA over merit pay issue.

How were you made aware of the reactions: officially, e.g. Minister of Education, or unofficially, e.g. newspaper reports?

No official feedback. Unofficially was asked to speak at lots of meetings to discuss pro's and con's, also had feedback from individuals.

(In meetings: approach to explain basis on which recommendations made - if personnaly thought that he could defend the Report - did so - but took no official stand on differences within Commission.)

Were you happy with this reaction?

Little feedback from Departmental officials - saw this as "proper."

Lay groups acceptance not necessarily agreement.

Can you recall any details of the implementation?

Did the Government or Department of Education act expeditiously?
Did many of the recommendations require government approval?
Could many of the recommendations be brought in by the Department acting on its own initiative?
Do you feel that any of the recommendations were ignored or discarded by the authorities; if so can you suggest why?

See ATA document on implementation - felt score was in favour of Commission.

Were you aware of an improvement in education in Alberta subsequent to the Commission?

Not markedly.

Would you attribute this to the Commission alone?

No.

Did any of the features of Alberta's education remain a source of concern for you?

Abandonment of exams by Department - as a means of setting standards of achievement, especially for small high schools.

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

Significant Accomplishments:

a. Forum for public discussion of education.
b. Provision of document which served as a basis for further discussion.

Can you list any definite criticisms?

A better operational strategy would have been to examine the role of government in public education via relationship with districts, professional groups, etc. This would be the starting point of a Commission if he were doing it now - Cameron Commission had assumption: that all parts should be bound by each substantial recommendation - this was borne out by evidence in hearings - the groups and individuals wanted their ideas accepted and put into effect by Department for everyone - i.e. mass action.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta, been by the 1959 Commission?

Can't tell because of difficulty of unravelling cause and effect.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning?

Do you think it was necessary?
Why did it arise?
Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon?
Did you contribute to this Commission?
Would you way that there was much difference between the 1959 and 1969 investigations?
What did the 1969 Commission accomplish?
Which do you think had the greater impact?

Not surprised that Commission set up - but surprised a little at the rapidity of its development - Note: period of new societal trends in 60s - not anticipated previously.

Worth Commission bears no relation to Cameron Commission, e.g. no mass concern for higher education. Political feeling of bad things in higher education - not thought of in 1959.

NAME: Mrs. W. C. Taylor

DATE: May 28, 1974

POSITION: Housewife, Businesswoman, highly involved in public service activities.

CATEGORY: Commissioner

BACKGROUND

Were you involved in the Advisory Committee on Education which was established by the Minister in September, 1957; that is, prior to the Commission? If so, could you tell me of its work?

> Yes. Included people in many organizations (Home and School, Rural, Women's Institute, Farmers' Union, Farm Women's Union, Alberta Federation of Agriculture). At Alberta Administration Building - not just once. Appointed by Minister - trying to get opinions on setting up a Commission. Mrs. Taylor put view of rural and farm people for Commission.

EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES

Could you indicate the factors which were prominent in your thinking on education at the time of the Commission?

> Had been a teacher - lived in country 20 years - felt rural children didn't have equality of opportunity - only "lip service" paid. e.g. University - expense of boarding. Lived through 30s - helped student with correspondence course.

Could you briefly describe the philosophy of education underlying Albertan education at the time of the Commission?

> All young people to be able to develop their innate capabilities, e.g. against Guidance Counsellors saying all students to go to University. (One important point of Commission: accomplished and aroused interest in community colleges.
>
> Progressivism vs essentialism - Commission tried to take middle of the road course, that is, to take the best of both schools of philosophy.

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Why were you selected to work on the Commission?

> Aalborg rang to ask. Represented rural people as I had been on Farm Union Executive for five years - Past President of Farm Women's Union.

Why did you accept the task?

Felt could contribute, humble as to ability "i$ they think I can do it I will try." Family married, husband at farm all day therefore had time.

What was your particular contribution?

Viewpoint of rural people, e.g. background: farm living, President of Farm Women - Executive of FUA - travelled all over Province. Had drawn up recommendations on education for Convention in December of that year of FWUA, later taken to FUA.

Can you suggest why a royal commission on education should have been set up just at that time?

Great deal of criticism of educational system, e.g. project method - i.e. implementation - was the only method used by many new teachers - rural people particularly concerned. Teacher shortage - expecially in rural areas.

What did you understand to be the Commission's main task?

To review whole field of education excluding financing.

What of its main purpose? (Would you diffentiate these?)

To prepare recommendations to guide change.

Do you know of any groups or individuals who were opposed to setting up of the Commission?

No.

If you had been given the job of initiating an investigation into Alberta education in the 1950s, what form would it have taken?

Yes to having Royal Commission but as well, would want a continuing committee - assessing continuously.

Were you satisfied with the terms of reference?

In general, but wanted some consideration of finance.

Were you satisfied with the membership of the Commission?

Good size and representation. (More so than Worth Commission - women excluded and no rural representation.)

CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

How did the Commission decide on its mode of operation?

Aim: To hear what people had to say on education therefore took map of Alberta - plotted meetings so as to make Commission accessible - no one more than 50 miles from a place where Commission sat.

Promoted through Home and School and FUA and FWUA. (It was suggested that they discuss education in their local groups, present briefs, attend hearings, etc.)

What part did you play in carrying out its work?

Five days per week travelling or in Edmonton and to various centres. Received brief ahead - listened and questioned at hearing.

(Went to Europe during Commission - looked at Schools and discussed in Commission - but this was a private trip.)

Called in individuals, e.g. Government officials to give evidence.

Did you feel you were tapping public and other opinion adequately?

Yes.

How satisfactory was the operation at the time?

Good.

Were you hindered in your task in any way?

No.

Did you feel there were any sections of the province: areas, groups, individuals, whose opinion was important but it did not reach you? If so, could you provide any reasons?

Yes there might well have been people who because they felt they lacked ability to voice their feelings did not come forward - but didn't specify any.

CONCERNING THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

How did you deal with the large number of possible recommendations?

Discussed all areas with as many Commissioners as possible, certain Commissioners were responsible for certain areas - prepared draft - more discussions - then finally made their recommendations.

What criteria of selection/rejection were used?

Doesn't remember criteria.

Which submissions were of most value in deciding on recommendations: briefs, individual comments, expert reports, others?

Teachers' brief especially, hearings (general public's thinking came out). Research studies plus own thinking.

CONCERNING THE COMMISSION'S REPORT

What part did you play in compiling the Report?

Given certain areas to work up drafts on; took part in discussion on all.

Overall, were you satisfied with the method of reporting?

Yes.

What was your reaction to the presentation of the Minority Report in addition to the Main Report?

Felt this was any Commissioner's right but surprised that Cormack did not assist more with input into the Majority Report in order to put his views forward.

Do you think the presence of a Minority Report influenced people in their acceptance/rejection of the changes the Commission wished to have made to improve education in Alberta?

Felt that each Commissioner had the right to present a Minority Report if he felt strongly enough. I am sure the opinions in Minority Report were considered in conjunction with Majority Report.

Some of the press comment was very favourable to the Minority Report. What was your reaction to that?

Felt that much press comment was ill-informed and when people actually read the Majority Report they backed down on their criticisms, e.g. The Albertan.

Do you think the Minority Report had any effect at all?

Was taken into consideration by Government and Department in their discussions of the Report.

Do you think the Commission's Report directly influenced subsequent educational change or merely anticipated changes which would have occurred anyway?

Originated: In one area: community colleges (served on Colleges Commission).

Commission did present a consensus of public opinion and therefore Commission served to crystallize thinking on various changes which were being thought of at the time.

CONCERNING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

What reaction to the Report did you expect from the following: Government, Department of Education, the ATA, ASTA, other organizations, other influential individuals, Albertans generally?

Didn't worry about possible reaction.

What, in fact, were the reactions?

Master Teacher scheme, merit pay for teachers - ATA anti-these and vocal about it.

How were you made aware of the reactions: officially, e.g. Minister of Education or unofficially, e.g. newspaper reports?

Commissioners got copies of Report - Informally details obtained from press.

Were you happy with this reaction?

Yes, in general but felt adoption procedures so slow that conditions had changed somewhat by the time they were implemented.

Do you recall any details of the implementation?

Did the Government of Department of Education act expeditiously?
Did many of the recommendations require government approval?
Could many of the recommendations be brought in by the Department acting on its own initiative?
Do you feel that any of the recommendations were ignored or discarded by the authorities; if so can you suggest why?

Frustration government/Department took so long in implementation.

These worked on quickly: Health and Social Development course, Public Colleges; also encouraged people to object about teaching methods (because showed them it was not policy of government - only of some teachers).

Commission brought out many angles of dissatisfaction.

Merit pay dropped because of teachers' stand and because of difficulty of implementation.

Were you aware of an improvement in education in Alberta subsequent to the Commission?

Felt subsequent changes were good - people have said to Mrs. Taylor that it has had good effects.

Would you attribute this to the Commission alone?

Commission acted as catalyst; other appropriate conditions necessary.

Did any of the features of Alberta's education remain a source of concern for you?

Community college movement for rural people.

Merit pay for teachers.

I noted in newspaper reports of the time that the Commissioners seemed to be present at a number of meetings discussing the Report, (for some time after it was presented). Were you involved in this activity. Was it expected?

Voluntary - spoke at a lot of meetings of people interested in knowing more about Report, e.g. Vegreville meeting (see copy of speech).

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

Catalyst at a time of criticism, allowed ventilation of whole issue. Interest in post secondary education stimulated from interest shown by Commission in this area; showed people they could have input into education system - they did "have a say."

Can you list any definite criticisms?

No.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta been by the 1959 Commission?

See question regarding details of implementation (page).
Divided year - semester system. Locally employed superintendents.
Variety of methods for teaching. Agricultural-community colleges.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning?

Do you think it was necessary?
Why did it arise?
Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon?
Did you contribute to this Commission?
Would you say that there was much difference between the 1959 and 1969 investigations?
What did the 1969 Commission accomplish?
Which do you think had the greater impact?

Not surprised about 1969 Commission because government didn't implement 1959 recommendation on a continuing Commission, therefore need arose within decade for 1969 Report.

Difficult to understand - very vague - no index for reference.

As Commissioner Worth achieved position of eminence afterwards therefore likely that Commission will have a strong impact - has sufficient influence to have recommendations implemented.

Mrs. Taylor didn't contribute to this Commission but attended some public meetings held by that Commission.

60s great expectations for what education could do - disappointment therefore focussed on lack of evidence of great improvement.

1969 Commission more interested in underlying philosophy of education.

1959 Commission stressed more the mechanics of system - therefore easier than delving more deeply into philosophy.

Mrs. Taylor - maybe Commission didn't spend as much time on philosophy but had many concrete problems to grapple with.

N.B. (See Mrs. Taylor's speeches to various groups - could be used as additional source of data.)

e.g. (Businessmen they interviewed wanted all people to have high school diploma because this was their only criterion for judging ability and stick-to-it-iveness of students.)

INTERVIEWS: GROUP (B) CIVIL SERVANTS

NAME: Dr. T. C. Byrne

DATE: Friday, June 14, 1974

POSITION: Chief Superintendent of Schools

CATEGORY: Civil Servant

EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES: PHILOSOPHY

What did you perceive as the underlying philosophy of education in Alberta at that time?

Whose philosophy?

Philosophy of teacher is more important - official documents have philosophical statements, e.g. by Director of Curriculum, but really few liberals in Alberta education; emphasised only a few, that is, real supporters of progressivism - restraints on them because of climate of times - really conservative, e.g. Director of Curriculum - Social Crediter, Dep. Minister - Conservative. Amount of progressivism limited - enterprise program - kind of expression of liberalism of 30s - diffusion from U.S. via Department - people with U.S. training - Essential part of enterprise - teachers free to plan activities and consult with learners - misinterpreted - and also became attenuated by 1950s.

As Superintendent, 1942-49, Byrne promoted this with his teachers but then pendulum swung back to conservatism and a special superintendent was put into department to give structure to the program - succeeded in diluting its effect.

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Who initiated the move to establish a royal commission on education?

Note: No civil servant encourages a body to monitor Civil service activities.

General: Politicians initiate them because it advertises their leadership, "buys" time, something good may come out of it.

Note: Criticism of education expressed as rabid feeling especially in press-(J. Cormack reflects this).

Criticism results in seeking for a solution. Answer: Royal Commission: Criticism from small minority groups and media - climate late 50s - conservatism flowing across Canada in education - last outburst of universities against sense of movement against elitism in education - stress on mass education - e.g. traditional for new university president to make a speech condemning public schools.

What was the Commission's main purpose?

"To put the lid on."

(Minister - a teacher from a two-room school - bright mind, energy, practical sense - no background of academic training - hard-working, ruined his health trying to be both Minister and Deputy Minister.)

What was the Commission's main task? (Can you differentiate between them?)

Let everyone who wanted, have a say.

What part did the Department of Education play in this?

None.

OPERATION

What part, if any, was played by the Department of Education?

Not too much - but Dr. Mowat - very strong influence and very stubborn (the rest of the Committee didn't realise this). Dr. Rees - wouldn't influence - facilitated meetings - cautious - burned by press. Byrne appeared two three times - to talk about social studies - he was called to private meetings - progressive view given. Director of Curriculum - Watts - also called - gave conservative view. Knew Cameron and Mowat personally, they turned to him because of his emphasis on expertise in curriculum, instruction and supervision.

TABLING - IMPLEMENTATION

Was the Department and Deputy Minister's reaction favourable?

Neutral reaction - no civil servant gets excited about commissions - Committee operated aside from Department - few links of direct participation of Department - conjecture about what report would mean. Decentralization of curriculum; teacher participation in curriculum; examinations.

Which areas of recommendation were most important in the Department's view?

School accreditation - local appointment of superintendents. (Byrne and Mowat agreed.)

(Commission's Report - had degrees of liberality beyond what some in Department expected - e.g. Curriculum Director.)

Were there any recommendations contrary to Government or Departmental policy at that time?

No.

QUESTIONS RELATING TO HIS POSITION AS CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT

What part did the Department play after the report was tabled?

Were conferences held to discuss the recommendations? If so, who participated?
What was done with respect to implementation?
What criteria were used for decisions on whether to implement recommendations?
How was the implementation carried out, e.g. by the use of circulars, Departmental regulations, via the School Boards, involvement with the ATA, inservice courses?

"Backroom Boys," Committee of Departmental civil servants going about business - looked at all recommendations - Byrne eventually became Chairman - debated, practical aspect was major criterion as well as philosophical considerations, e.g. Byrne argued on accreditation - Director of Curriculum - very conservative view of education, therefore dialogue between Byrne and Watts became focal point for crystallising debate. There were six members on the Committee, e.g. senior officials and members from University.

Premise for Working:

Committee ought to accept recommendations - then debate on:
(a) philosophical grounds
(b) practical matters of administration.

Some ideas were completely new - not in Departmental policy, e.g. accreditation, role of inspector - leading to emphasis on leadership and service, not supervision.

(One thing irritated everyone: Recommendation 280 - Planning Commission - e.g. much larger salaries suggested than Department officials enjoyed; would be like another Department operating independently and monitoring work of Department of Education.)

What was the extent of influence of the Commission on the Department of Education's subsequent policy-making?

Not much legislation required - Represented a victory for progressives - influence of Mowat and Mrs. Hansen - change in approach - affirmation of what had been verbalized previously but not found in practice. Text-book issue - fought out in Curriculum Subcommittees. There were differences between professional and lay opinions, e.g. Trustees - took anything which would enhance their positions. Department of Education Committee reported back to Minister over which recommendations were acceptable - did this a number of times.

What was the influence of the Commission on later changes in Albertan education or was it merely an anticipation of changes which would have occurred anyway?

Commission must interpret changes already imminent and recommend in that direction - therefore works more to anticipate. Commission needs to exercise care on what directions should be affirmed.

What was the reaction of the Department to the Minority Report?

Neutral.

Do you think that the Minority Report had any influence? If so, could you indicate in what way?

No.

Were any records kept of Departmental Committee discussions of the Report? If so, are they available for study?

Reports went to Minister - check Chief Superintendent's files (1956-64).

The Department of Education's Deputy Minister was reported in the press as saying that there were five problems to be defeated by the Department before recommendations could be implemented:

- lack of clarity
- was implementation a good thing
- possible ramifications of the recommendations
- who should implement recommendations
- administrative costs of recommendations.

Do you agree that these were problems? What part did you play in dealing with these problems?

See first question under "Questions Relating to his Position as Chief Superintendent" (page 361).

Overall, what was your responsibility in the implementation of recommendations?

Chairman of Departmental Committee.

Encouraged legislation, e.g. on accreditation. Worked through local school systems in developing something acceptable - led to School Accreditation Act. Took 8-9 years to be implemented.

Byrne worked in his position within the Department for decentralization of curricula, a range of authorized text books.

(The Commission's stand on liberal recommendations reflected in Ontario's Living and Learning Report.)

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

Liberal emphasis - additional legitimation for Byrne's position, i.e. gave focus to many of his activities - he was central in instruction field, expressed these views as much as possible - Commission allowed public opinion expression.

Can you list any definite criticisms?

Criticisms: Minority group's criticism was found in Minority Report. Ongoing operational research of whole system was what Planning Commission meant but only a good point now sixteen years later. If Commission had used words of this type - might have got civil servants on side - as it was it antagonised them.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta been by the 1959 Commission?

Quite long-lasting effect.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning:

Do you think it was necessary?
Why did it arise?
Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon?
Did you contribute to this Commission?
Would you say that there was much difference between the 1959 and 1969 investigations?
What did the 1969 Commission accomplish?
Which do you think had the greater impact?

Great differences between the two.

(Byrne - Deputy Minister, 1965-1970.)

Byrne very involved as Deputy Minister in 1969 Commission - was a political decision - certain advisors ("whiz kids") in Government - assisting in leadership campaign for Strom for Social Credit Government.

(Executive Assistant style exemplified "Kennedy" touch.)

This group recommended Commission do same for Alberta as Living and Learning for Ontario - strong influence with Strom as Premier and Clarke, Minister of Education - first task for Byrne - establishment of Commission - referred to Byrne - wanted a quite different one from Cameron Commission - look to future - ought to do different job - planning for new changes and needs - totality of education to be studied - all aspects including finance - more research approach - although public opinion too - one man could do this, i.e. Worth.

(Would not get a Minority Report, so press would not have another means for attacking education.)

NAME: Dr. R. Rees

DATE: Thursday, May 30, 1974

POSITION: High School Inspector

CATEGORY: Civil Servant,
Secretary of Commission

(Social Credit - Conservative in policies really.)

BACKGROUND

Where were you born?

Alberta.

Where did you grow up?

Alberta.

Did you receive your education in Alberta?

Postgraduate education at Northwestern - Chicago for Masters and Doctorate.

What position did you hold at the time of the Commission?

Department of Education High School Inspector (Maths/Science).

Could you outline your career prior to and after the Commission?

Almost immediately Assistant Chief Superintendent of Schools (1960) - Director of Special Education Services (1961) - Chief Superintendent of Schools (1966) - Byrne Deputy Minister - Associate Deputy Minister (1968), Deputy Minister of Education (1970), Deputy Minister of Advanced Education (1971).

Were you a member of the Advisory Committee on Education set up in September 1957 prior to the Commission? If so, could you comment on its work?

No.

EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES

Could you indicate the factors which were prominent in your thinking on education at the time of the Commission?

Education progressing well. In areas where emphasis needed, there were meetings of senior officials constantly urging for changes - 1957 Sputnik tremendous impact therefore critical wave against, especially, High School education, e.g. incorporated new Maths.

Could you briefly describe the philosophy underlying Albertan education at the time of the Commission?

Teachers unsure about philosophy and how to implement in the classroom - teachers not well qualified enough. Enterprise system had been in operation with integration of subjects but this required very able teaching. One recognized philosophy - education is to do with educating children not teaching subjects - but teachers and some members in community thought content should be dominant.

(Until 1954 was professor at University [Rees].)

Department of Education had clearly defined syllabi and Faculty of Education had to prepare students to teach certain subjects.

Faculty emphasized involvement "doing things" leading to problem-solving, but probably employed too much lecturing themselves in their teaching.

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Do you think that education was a high priority concern of the Government at that time?

Yes, e.g. spending increasing year by year.

What were other important social problems with which the Government had to deal?

Great emphasis on welfare of people and health.

What were the crucial factors influencing the setting up of the Commission in 1957?

People questioning way education being given - Thought there should be more emphasis on subject matter.

Didn't understand what teachers were doing. e.g. Development of thinking ability and group consciousness in children.

Who initiated the move to establish a royal commission on education?

Perhaps Minister of Education thought that criticism of American system of education applied to Alberta and influenced people in Alberta. N.B. Teachers in legislature not highly qualified and therefore not well informed on educational theory. May have grown out of Social Credit government - used to have Social Credit meetings (caucuses?) involved laymen - members of Social Credit Party.

What was the Commission's main purpose?

The investigation of education in province - assessment of adequacy - whole field except finance. Minister felt competent to handle finance himself.

Commission felt this keenly; to produce recommendations as to what directions they should follow in education.

What was the Commission's main task? (Can you differentiate between them?)

Procedures for determining investigation, e.g.
I. (a) Teachers - Total survey of province) Research Projects
(b) Objectives throughout education)

OR
II. Mechanics and techniques for obtaining information.

(Research direction - Mowat able research worker - very swift at beginning - research director would have been in difficulties without him.)

Briefs - schedules - hearings.
Analysis of briefs, etc. - synthesis of these for recommendations.

What part did the Government play in this?

Only authorised it by Order-in-Council - Government named Rees as secretary. (Commission to be finished within three years) - didn't interfere with expenses, ideas; budget set up in advance.

What part did the Department of Education play in this?

None. Commission called in Department officials as consultants.

Rees didn't know rights and privileges as Secretary when he was appointed and didn't get help from Department.

Could you describe the steps in the procedure for establishing the Commission?

No.

Who selected the Commissioners and Secretary?

Minister - had few names in mind for chairman and selected Cameron - Secretary named - no choice given.

Who defined the terms of reference?

Prior to setting up of Commission - Government and maybe very senior Department officials - Deputy Minister?

What criteria were used for these steps?

Don't know.

Why was the royal commission method of investigation chosen; what were the precedents for its use?

Traditional method - would satisfy people that it was an objective inquiry - not influenced by Government too much.

Royal Commission - can call witnesses and get answers - can charge people with contempt - extensive powers.

All invited to submit briefs (i.e. everyone in Alberta), all newspapers carried invitation to individuals, groups, organizations remote from education. Had scheduled meetings so even the isolated might have opportunity to attend.

CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

What part, if any, was played by the government?

None.

What part, if any, was played by the Department of Education?

None.

Was the Deputy Minister's reaction favourable?

Didn't know.

Which areas of recommendations were most important in the Government's view?

All were studied - most implemented during next decade.

CONCERNING THE TABLING OF THE REPORT AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

In general, what was the Government's reaction? (e.g. Did it see the need for rapid implementation?)

No feedback - Commission disbanded as soon as Report handed in except that Rees had to complete all last stages of business.

Was the Report in accord with the original Order-in-Council?

Yes.

Was the Deputy Minister's reaction favourable?

None - or doesn't know reaction.

Subsequently series of meetings called by Dr. Swift to examine every recommendation (whole 280) - Question - how can the recommendations be implemented (by Government, Faculty of Education, local boards, teachers). Fairly practical recommendations (according to Rees) - not all required legislation.

Which areas of recommendations were most important in the Government's view?

Assessed recommendation in terms of what could be done now, later or not at all.

In the Department's view?

Statements put out by Aalborg tell this.

Was there any recommendations contrary to Government or Departmental policy at that time?

Kindergartens recommended as part of Educational System.

How were decisions made to implement certain recommendations and not others, and to implement them at different times?

In terms of established criteria (see Swift).

What was the reaction of the public to the Report?

Not known.

Could you give any impressions of the reactions of organized groups, e.g. teachers, trustees, Home and School Association, etc.?

Favorable - no opposition to implementation of recommendations - no published statements.

What feedback reached the Government, e.g. from Departmental Committees and other sources?

Didn't know of any.

What part did this feedback play in the action taken by the Government?

Didn't know.

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the Report?

Didn't know.

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the action taken by the Government on the Report?

Didn't know.

RELATED TO POSITION AS SECRETARY

How were you selected for the position of Secretary?

Possibly by Swift/Byrne.

Who defined the Secretary's tasks?

In a session of the Commission - tasks defined. Was full time with Commission. He was asked to carry out Commissioner's job, e.g. discussing, analyzing, bringing forward proposals as for commissioners as well as specific duties as secretary.

Could you detail the tasks of the Secretary?

Cameron good chairman, gave all a chance to contribute. Recommendations formulated by Commissioners (a couple drafted something - back to general meeting).

Tasks:

Prior to the Commission:

1. Supplies
   Office space
   Equipment
   Office staff
   Assistant to secretary
   Stenos

During Operation:

2. Tasks as for Commissioners
3. Obtain reference material
   Checking research activities
4. Tape recorded transcripts of hearings
   Stenos with some shorthand and Rees dictated certain points of emphasis
5. Budget
6. Travelling and transportation and accommodation
7. Report: Rees wrote up some of sections - worked material into chapters.
   General chapter outlines (Mowat, Rees and Cameron) - Mowat and Cameron did most writing, Mrs. Hansen helped.
   (Douglas: useful and practical - did some discussing.)
   (Taylor: good critic.)
   Did get expert in field of English to go over whole thing for style, etc., and he got a substantial honorarium.

What was your opinion of the Commission: as a means of tapping province-wide opinion on education; as an instrument for utilizing this opinion for policy-making recommendations and for conducting research projects?

Good for obtaining province-wide opinion. Synthesis of recommendations; developed categories and put them into 5,000 recommendations.

(Meetings organized by Commission - to tell people of Commission's work, if area wanted to hear about it.)

Used Macbee card method (Rees and assistant) - brought in other experts to analyze, and so developed recommendations for policy-making.

Research - a most successful aspect of the Commission - information needed for discussions and decisions.

Do you think that the Commission did influence educational change in Alberta or did it merely anticipate change which would have occurred anyway?

Commission sensed concerns and put these down - therefore effort was made to anticipate needs to a certain extent and recommended how to meet this need - but Rees felt that it directed and initiated change more.

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

Feels many of recommendations were implemented, therefore did job, which showed them to be shrewd thinkers, i.e. could anticipate needs.

Can you list any definite criticisms?

None: Government didn't shelve problems - did something about it via the Commission.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta been by the 1959 Commission?

To quite an extent, e.g. community colleges, improvement in teacher education.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning:

Do you think it was necessary?
Why did it arise?
Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon?
Did you contribute to this Commission?
Would you say that there was much difference between the 1959 and 1969 investigations?
What did the 1969 Commission accomplish?
Which do you think had the greater impact?

1969 Commission: very different from 1959 - not a Royal Commission. (Same government set it up - doesn't know purpose.)

One commissioner. This commission concentrates on kind of society wanted - we can build what we want to have - people can build their (our) own type of society - what kind of social order?

Financing now more important.

New population balance: young (very important sector) vs old.

People had great faith in education - then in late 1960s could see that educated people were not excluded from unemployment - uncertainty - education dysfunctional?

1960s period of activism for young people - raise awareness level of dissatisfactions of youth. Indians and Metis became more outspoken (called Deputy Minister in and gave him the sort of psychological putting down that they had got - Byrne, Deputy Minister).

U.S. University activists came up to organize Canadian students - government might have wondered if something should be done to counteract youth activism.

Worth: favourable towards early childhood education or kindergarten (did research on this).

Premier called large meeting of ethnic groups at Government House - talk of every language group getting equality, i.e. the feasible extent of having all languages in school where wanted.

Time of lacking of "controls" over various groups, e.g. Hutterites private schools (minister - government - gave grants to these).

(Rees not consulted over this Commission - nor anyone in Department, but a number of departmental staff participated on a part time basis.)

NAME: Dr. W. H. Swift DATE: June 29, 1974

POSITION: Deputy Minister CATEGORY: Civil Servant

BACKGROUND

Were you associated with the Advisory Committee on Education set up in September 1957, prior to the Commission? If so, could you tell me of its work?

Advisory Committee - Dr. Swift assisted by giving advice on people to be on it, e.g. trustees, teachers, H. & S., Chamber of Commerce and so on. Not very productive.

Purpose: To achieve communication between Department of Education, Government and public.

EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES

What factors were prominent in your thinking on education at the time of the Commission?

(Reference: Preliminary statements in Department Annual Reports - Report of Director of Curriculum.)

Finance always before Government but this was not part of Royal Commission. There was criticism because financial considerations were omitted from Commission, e.g. from Trustees, teachers, H. & S.

Reasons why not included in terms of reference for Commission: Government about to set up study with respect to municipal/provincial financial arrangements, therefore didn't need it in Royal Commission on Education.

(1) Finance already being studied and (2) Government wanted information on and public airing of curriculum and service aspects of education system.

Teacher shortage - also of concern.

In general, there were contrasting criticisms:
Many voices demanded democratization of education, i.e. school offerings to be extended. More available for all - particularly vocational and general education, i.e. education considered too academic which led to a dropout problem.

But: Voices demanding rigour - mental discipline - excellence, e.g. influence of Sputnik.

(N.B. H. & S. associations very influential - 20 years ago Department took careful note of what they had to say, e.g. Deputy Minister attended their annual conventions.)

But: All groups of teachers, trustees, H. & S. were ambivalent in 1950s on which trend should dominate in Alberta. Criticism of

Alberta high school system - it was alleged that Alberta students not being accepted in Universities outside the province because courses were weak, standards low, etc. - this idea achieved a high level of public acceptance - came to be believed. Deputy Minister and colleagues tried to find out how this had arisen and whether it was true - and therefore what to do about it. e.g. Tried to find cases of exclusion - resulted in a very small list and there were logical explanations for each, so that idea was disproved as far as Swift was concerned. However, Minister and Government were still concerned as to whether this was true, and especially as to whether the public could be given factual information.

Could you describe the philosophy underlying Albertan education at the time of the Commission?

Didn't have a precisely defined philosophy except when Watts became Director of Curriculum, 1945. He proceeded using system of curriculum committees to set forth a statement of objects and purposes of education set out in Bulletin No. 1 - Had "something for everybody." One exception: (reflects Watts and Minister of Education Ansley) that education should be based on Christianity and democracy but curriculum committees didn't pay much attention to these aims and objectives in their periodic deliberations and conclusions.

SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Do you think that education was a high priority concern of the Government at that time?

Yes.

What were other important social problems with which the Government had to deal?

Health and welfare, e.g. Jorgenson; concerned about senior citizens.

What were the crucial factors influencing the setting up of the Commission in 1957?

See comments under "Attitudes" (pages 372-373). No doubt partly a genuine concern over possible weaknesses, a desire to resolve public differences, and to get the total problem into another arena.

Who initiated the move to establish a royal commission on education?

Cabinet - don't know if any individual went to Government. Opinion: decision rested on two factors - (1) genuine Government concern to have assistance of in-depth study and expression of public opinion; (2) Because of extensive criticism of education, to remove temporarily at least the focus of attack upon Department and Government by providing an alternative focus - place where critics might take complaints and air them - and express their educational views.

What was the Commission's main purpose?

See above question. Also see the Terms of Reference which presumably epitomized the Government's thinking.

What was the Commission's main task? (Can you differentiate between them?)

To find out what people were thinking. Opportunity for people to have a say - recommendations expected. Expert information (or knowledge?) - Department didn't really expect this. Thinks the Minister was surprised when large sums of money were requested for research. Swift: knew Commission members well, had high regard for them.

What part did the government play in this?

Cabinet initiated Commission - determined terms of reference.

What part did the Department of Education play in this?

Deputy Minister had hand in suggesting possible names for Commission. Supplied secretary. Involved in suggesting and editorializing terms of reference, but it was not a Departmental child.

Could you describe the steps in the procedure for establishing the Commission?

Consultations, drafts of documents, etc. leading to passage of Order-in-Council.

Who selected the Commissioners and Secretary?

Cabinet through Minister with the advice of the Deputy Minister. The Chairman's name evolved at Cabinet level.

Who defined the terms of reference?

Department of Education officials, e.g. Chief Superintendent and Director of Curriculum, prepared draft, sent it to Minister and Cabinet (e.g. draft → Government → sent back to Department, etc. until satisfactory). Functions of Department - mechanical, editorial, advisory.

What criteria were used for these steps?

If this refers back to the above question there were no criteria - just the normal channels of advice and assistance between Minister and his staff.

Why was the royal commission method of investigation chosen; what were the precedents for its use?

A traditional method; no other means of dealing with the concern were discussed, at least with Deputy Minister. Whether a Legislative Committee was given consideration I don't know.

OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

What part, if any, was played by the Government?

Senator Cameron came to see Minister (and Deputy Minister) to let Minister know how Commission was coming along and to ask for funds. No other Government department interfered - involvement was otherwise minimal.

What part, if any, was played by the Department of Education?

Dr. Rees, a high school inspector, was Secretary - supplied information and statistics - Deputy Minister attended a few of the hearings and was interrogated once - phone call from Rees inviting him over some issue, i.e. Grade 12 examinations; disappointed that officers of Department were seldom called on for information - couldn't understand it, since they had most direct knowledge of many arrangements and practices.

Was there any Cabinet or caucus discussion of the Commission while it was in operation?

Don't know.

Was it incumbent on the Commissioners to report their progress from time to time during the two years of their investigation? If so, what form did that reporting take.

No.

TABLING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT

In general, what was the Government's reaction? (Did it see the need for rapid implementation?)

Was the Report in accord with the original Order-in-Council?

Can't recall Minister demonstrating great enthusiasm or antagonism - just accepted it. Most pressing problem about how to get it printed. (No arrangements - crisis.) The Department assumed that the Commission would make its own arrangements to have the report printed and in any event had not been consulted. The Commission made no arrangements, presented its report with attendant publicity, but there were no copies available. Department had to print it.

The report dealt with the matters covered by the terms of reference in the Order-in-Council.

Was the Deputy Minister's reaction favourable?

Overwhelmed by the number of recommendations - thought some recommendations impractical - not clear as to where they were being directed: Government, school boards or public. On the whole document was worth looking at. Problem with report, so voluminous - hard to find time to read all and study, especially items having wide ramifications.

Which areas of recommendations were most important in the Government's view?

Can't say.

In the Department's view?

#280 - on continuing Planning Commission; was one which Department saw as impractical.

What was the nature and extent of legislation required?

Not a lot of actual legislation required - more policy and administrative changes by Order-in-Council, Regulations, and practice.

Were there any recommendations contrary to Government or Departmental policy at that time?

Not in any specific sense. Largely it was a matter of change of emphasis or practice. Practice does not necessarily imply a policy in any formalized sense.

How were decisions made to implement certain recommendations and not others, and to implement them at different times?

At the request of the Government a Departmental Committee (Deputy Minister and Senior Officers and Dr. H. Baker from University) - met over period of weeks and looked at each of 280 recommendations individually. Discussed them in terms of criteria established by Cabinet and conveyed by Minister. Questions asked: Is recommendation: good thing, feasible, whose responsibility, cost? Committee established these points and after about each 12 submitted their opinion to Minister and Cabinet - final decision in their hands. Government probably considerably influenced by the sober analysis of each as set forth by the Committee.

What was the reaction of the public to the Report?

Could you give any impressions of the reactions of organized groups, e.g. teachers, trustees, Home and School Association, etc.?

See press reports of time.

What feedback reached the Government, e.g. from Departmental Committees and other sources?

Very little, except from organized groups, and as indicated under question "How were decisions made to implement certain recommendations and not others, and to implement them at different times" (page 376).

What part did this feedback play in the action taken by the Government?

Presumably considered when Cabinet making final decision.

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the Report?

Don't know.

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the action taken by the Government on the Report?

Don't know.

QUESTIONS RELATED TO POSITION AS DEPUTY MINISTER OF EDUCATION

What part did the Government play after the Report was tabled?

a. Were conferences held to discuss the recommendations? If so, who participated?
b. What was done with respect to implementation?
c. What criteria were used for decisions on whether to implement recommendations or not?
d. How was the implementation carried out, e.g. by use of circulars, Departmental regulations, via the School Boards, involvement with the ATA, inservice courses.

a. - c. See answer to question "How were decisions made to implement certain recommendations and not others, and to implement them at different times?" (page 376).

d. - e.g. Curriculum - used Department's committees and subcommittees put out information in bulletins - subject to overriding authority of Minister and/or Deputy Minister.

But note:

Centralization vs decentralization of education a concern at the time. School boards and their systems to have greater freedom. Dilemma: e.g. to insist on uniformity of policy as decided by department or allow local autonomy, so answer in d. not clearcut.

What was the extent of influence of the Commission on the Department of Education's subsequent policy-making?

Little direct influence.

What was the influence of the Commission on later changes in Albertan education or was it merely anticipation of changes which would have occurred anyway?

Extremely difficult to assess. One of many factors in the mix of public opinion. Commission in general - anticipated some of the changes which would have occurred anyway.

What was the reaction of the Department to the Minority Report?

Department less influenced by Minority Report than by Majority Report.

Do you think the Minority Report had any influence? If so, could you indicate in what way?

Dr. Swift not aware of significant influence.

Were any records kept of Departmental Committees' discussions of the report? If so, are they available for study.

No. There might be something in minutes of General Curriculum Committee of the time, but not known for sure. No permanent records were kept of the ad hoc committee.

It was reported in the press that the opposition in the Legislature criticised the Government for "evading" Cameron Commission recommendations. What is your opinion of that view?

No - Because of the nature of recommendations (too vague or did not indicate concrete steps to be taken - taken by whom - Government? Department? School Board?); implementation appeared slow and Department and Government found it difficult to explain just what had been done. Many of the recommendations were really the expressions of a point of view or attitude and could not be implemented by law, edict, regulation or the like.

You were reported in the press of April 8, 1960 as saying that there were five problems to be defeated by the Department before recommendations could be implemented:

Lack of clarity in the recommendations
Was implementation a good thing?
Possible ramifications of the recommendations?
Who should implement recommendations?
Administrative costs of recommendations?

Did these delay implementation?
Were they all resolved?
Any other comment?

With some aspects - Departmental Committee grasped recommendation, considered, gave positive guidance or direction to Minister but for many, the Committee was unable to feel that they had completed this task.

There frequently seemed to be an opinion (held by at least one member of the Commission) that because something had been recommended it should be implemented. Actually the recommendations were expressions of opinions after careful study, but the Government, not the Commission has the right of decision.

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

Very desirable to provide forum for discussion by public organizations.

Revealed the ambivalence of views held by the public.

Forced persons and organizations who put forward points of view to examine their own thinking and clarify own positions.

Some things during process which had been criticised, were found not to be too bad after all.

Can you list any definite criticisms?

Many recommendations not in utilizable form. Commission should have obtained more background information from officers of Department of Education. Nature of royal commissions - what is accomplished almost always seems to be less than expectations, expense, effort put in.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta, been by the 1959 Commission?

It is difficult to pinpoint or assess influence. There was little that could in, say, one year, or two years, be specifically pointed to as an outcome of the Commission. Its voice soon become melded into the continuing melange of voices always being heard about education.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning:

Do you think it was necessary?
Why did it arise?
Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon?
Did you contribute to this Commission?
Would you say that there was much difference between the 1959 and 1969 investigations?
What did the 1969 Commission accomplish?
Which do you think had the greater impact?

Dr. Swift had no reason to anticipate (in 1959) that there would be another Commission - 10 years later but it was not surprising when it eventuated because new problems had arisen, e.g. expansion and organization of post-secondary education; 1960s faced head on the question of curriculum control vs curriculum freedom, e.g.

is it to the advantage of education to have central control over what is taught in schools or to have teacher autonomy?

The cost of education once population bulge had ceased, during 50s and 60s: great expectation - i.e. the more education the better, education a good thing: by end of 60s there were serious doubters as to whether this was true (other problems such as drug abuse weakened faith in education) - led to a real DISILLUSIONMENT.

INTERVIEWS: GROUP (C) POLITICAL FIGURES

NAME: Senator E. Manning DATE: July 2, 1974

POSITION: Premier CATEGORY: Political

BACKGROUND

Could you indicate the factors which were foremost in your thinking on education at the time of the Commission?

> Whole country's education in transition - techniques and methods - administration, e.g. finance - great increase in public interest in education.

Do you have any views on the philosophy(ies) underlying education in Alberta at that time?

> Matter of concern for Departmental officials - ATA and ASTA - seen in submissions to government.
>
> Aware of conflicts - traditional vs progressivist.
>
> Time of transition.

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Was education a high priority concern of the Government at that time?

> Yes, number one.

What other important social problems were occupying Government attention at that time?

> Social services, e.g. Health, pensions.

What were the crucial factors influencing the setting up of the Commission in 1957?

> Government philosophy - tried to maintain close liaison with public - therefore Commission was a natural outgrowth - Tried to anticipate problems and needs, ahead of time.

Who initiated the move to establish a royal commission on education?

> Representatives of all major provincial organizations used to meet Cabinet. From these arose idea of a Commission. Also influenced by Departmental inputs.

What was the Commission's main purpose?

In-depth study of education, to provide recommendations for Government on policy - also for school boards, teachers, information to public.

What was the Commission's main task?

See question above.

Who selected the Commissioners and Secretary?

Minister of Education in consultation with Department of Education - made recommendations. Discussed and revised in Cabinet.

Who defined the terms of reference?

Department of Education - result of number of Cabinet discussions, back to Cabinet for revisions.

What criteria were used for these steps?

No answer. See Minister and Deputy Minister's comments.

Why was the royal commission method of investigation chosen?

Most suitable - had statutory authority which gave it broad power, high status.

There was authorization for a number of royal commissions at that time. Was this why the same method was used for the education inquiry?

In part, yes.

What were the main influences leading you to concur with the need for an educational commission?

See above under question "Could you indicate the factors which were foremost in your thinking on education at the time of the Commission?" (page 381).

CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

What part, if any, was played by the Government?

Information provided by Department of Education officials. Government assessment of findings and recommendations.

Was there any Cabinet or Caucus discussion of the Commission while it was in operation?

No, other than verbal progress reports to Cabinet from the Minister of Education.

CONCERNING THE TABLING OF THE REPORT AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

In general, what was the Government's reaction?

Favourable.

What was the Minister of Education's reaction?

Part 1 - information and recommendations.

Part 2 - practical problems of implementation.

Questions government had to ask: Feasible, economically, financially, politically, etc., in line with public wishes.

Which areas of recommendations were most important in the Government's view?

Department of Education had to make a thorough study and bring to Government order of priorities.

What was the nature and extent of legislation required?

Doesn't recall.

Were there any recommendations contrary to Government or Departmental policy at that time?

Doesn't recall.

How were the decisions made to implement certain recommendations and not others and to implement them at different times?

Order of priorities established.

What was the reaction of the public to the Report?

Generally, public reaction favourable - a lot of people didn't have detailed knowledge.

What was the reaction of organized groups, e.g. teachers, Faculty of Education, trustees?

These groups studied Report very carefully and reported reactions back to Cabinet in their submissions.

What feedback reached the Government?

See previous question.

What part did this feedback play in the action taken by the Government?

Feedback weighed by Government in establishing priorities and timing of implementation.

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the Report?

No general opposition - individual members disagreed with various proposals.

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the action taken by the Government?

See above.

What was your reaction to the statement of the Minister of Education made in the Legislature that the Cameron Commissioners had missed the main aims and objectives of education in their Report?

Government felt certain concerns had not been dealt with specifically.

What was your reaction to the statements made by the Provincial Treasurer in the Legislature and outside deriding the working and effect of royal commissions?

Valid criticism but must be careful of generalization.

What was your reaction to the Minority Report? What was its influence?

Don't overrate publicity given - that is natural - when there is dissension.

Can serve useful purpose - represents a segment of public thinking which Government is responsible to recognize.

To what extent did the Cameron Report or the Commission as a whole influence subsequent Government policy-making on education.

It was one factor which was weighed in conjunction with others.

Did the Commission directly influence change in education in the Province or merely anticipate changes that would have occurred anyway?

Was a significant input - accelerated some changes, retarded others.

Commission tended to anticipate changes which would have occurred anyway.

SUMMATION

What do you think are the particular advantages of the royal commission as a method of investigation?

Useful for in-depth inquiries because of legislative authorization. Indirect impact on important groups should be noted.

What do you think are the particular disadvantages of the royal commission as a method of investigation?

Value tends to be overrated - disturbing to see relatively small number of recommendations implemented considering the expense involved.

What do you see as the achievements of the Cameron Royal Commission?

Considerable impact on organizations - stimulated public discussion, perhaps changed attitudes.

What do you see as the weaknesses of the Cameron Royal Commission?

None - except not very influential with respect to change but this is general for Commission.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta been by the 1959 Commission?

Not a great deal.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning which would indicate how it differed from the Royal Commission of 1969?

Education findings become obsolete quickly - need changes in education. Increase in population, growth in school enrolment continued, and building requirements - therefore needed another review. Public interest continued - probably greater in 1969 than 1959.

N.B. (Recommendation 280: not favoured because Government thought this was the normal task of the Department of Education anyway.)

NAME: Mr. A. Aalborg **DATE:** Monday, May 27, 1974

POSITION: Minister of Education **CATEGORY:** Political

BACKGROUND

Where were you born?

Alberta.

Where did you grow up?

Alberta.

Did you receive your education in Alberta?

Yes.

What was your occupation before entering politics?

School teacher for 19 years.

When did you enter politics?

1948 - September 1971.

When did you assume the position of Minister of Education?

September, 1952; later became Provincial Treasurer.

EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES

Could you indicate the major influences on your attitude to education at the time of the Commission?

Experience as teacher over 19 years, ATA involvement; active at local level and 4 years Provincial executive, 2 years Vice President of ATA - ran for President but did not succeed.

How would you describe the philosophy underlying Albertan education at the time of the Commission?

Very difficult to label educational philosophy in Alberta.

Main strand of philosophy: task of school system to provide child with opportunity to develop his capabilities to their greatest possible extent, leans more to progressive side rather than essentialist. (Became teacher in early 30s, at time of ferment.)

Other main strand of philosophy: educate child as a person. Province had responsibility to make available opportunities to all children up to secondary school level, that is, equal opportunity concept.

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Was education a high priority concern of the Government at that time?

Yes - top priority with health.

What other important social problems were occupying Government attention at that time?

Health, other welfare services.

What were the crucial factors influencing the setting up of the Commission in 1957?

Dominant: 1957 Alberta well into post-war era - needed investigation to provide guidelines on future policy + finding knowledge to solve problems, e.g. teacher training, teacher supply, school building, transportation.

Who initiated the move to establish a royal commission on education?

Minister of Education had regular meetings with teachers, trustees, Home and School Association and with Department officials too - all of these urging inquiry into education. Teachers perhaps more aggressive in seeking study - gave more of a lead than other groups.

What was the Commission's main purpose?

To do a thoroughgoing and comprehensive study of elementary and secondary systems in Alberta.

What was the Commission's main task?

Did not differentiate these terms.

What part did the Government play in this?

(a) Terms of reference drafted by senior officials of Department of Education transmitted to Cabinet for discussion and approval.

(b) Considered who should be appointed, again Department and Cabinet.

(c) Issued Order-in-Council, that is, a minute of Cabinet.

What part did the Department of Education play in this?

See preceding question.

Could you describe the steps in the procedure for setting up the Commission?

Minute of Cabinet or Executive Council, derived authority and means of legitimating inquiry from Public Inquiries Act and Department of Education Act which gave authority for Executive Council and Department of Education to conduct inquiries into education.

Who selected the Commissioners and Secretary?

Policy: Commission to be representative - men and women from various organizations and interests in education field, e.g. Roman Catholic separate system, Home and School (parents), rural, professional educators.

N.B. Suggestions came from Department of Education, etc. to Cabinet where put forward by Minister of Education. Chairman: a number of names but Senator Cameron's came up. Aalborg rang him and he agreed.

Who defined terms of reference?

Department of Education - Cabinet.

What criteria were used for these steps?

To achieve comprehensive study of school system.

Why was the royal commission method of investigation chosen?

There was authorization for a number of royal commissions at that time. Was this why the same method was used for the education inquiry?

Usual method: Royal Commission has best standing - "top notch, top drawer" method for investigating something important.

What were the main influences leading you to concur with the need for an educational commission?

Aalborg promoted the Commission; thought the time was right.

CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

What part, if any, was played by the Government?

Discussed budget with Senator Cameron - remuneration for Commission, budget, etc. - $200,000 approximately set as framework within which Commission had to work.

Was there any Cabinet or Caucus discussion of the Commission while it was in operation?

No.

Was it incumbent on the Commissioners to report their progress from time to time during the two years of their investigation? If so, how was this done?

No.

CONCERNING THE TABLING OF THE REPORT AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

In general, what was the Government's reaction?

Favourable towards Report; experienced pressure to get Report out quickly, e.g. by newspapers.

What was the Minister of Education's reaction?

Fine job - although had hoped for unanimous report - more desirable. Occasions when Senator Cameron came on own initiative when Report being formulated - to say problems had arisen and eventually to indicate that a Minority Report was to be presented as well as a Majority Report.

What was the Deputy Minister's reaction?

Happy.

Which areas of recommendations were most important in the Government's view?

Teacher training.

What was the nature and extent of legislation required?

Amendments to the School Act were required.

Were there any recommendations contrary to Government or Departmental policy at that time?

What to do with Minority Report.

How were the decisions made to implement certain recommendations and not others and to implement them at different times?

Became an ongoing process - meetings of Department of Education officials and Faculty of Education - over changes in legislation. e.g. Liaison group between Department of Education and Faculty of Education, that is, Board of Teacher Education and certification - met and came forward with ideas on implementation.

What was the reaction of the public to the Report.

Teachers' conventions, Home and School meetings, many organizations requested speakers to explain Report. All of these meetings and the press indicated wide interest.

What was the reaction of organized groups, e.g. teachers, Faculty of Education, trustees?

See preceding question.

What feedback reached the Government?

Not much from public - reaction mainly through Faculty of Education, Alberta Chamber of Commerce, ATA - sent further written submissions.

What part did this feedback play in the action taken by the Government?

Also included when discussions taking place.

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the Report?

No.

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the action taken by the Government?

Criticism of slowness of implementation.

Was the Advisory Committee on education established prior to the Commission connected with the work of the Commission?

Inactive - idea to have broader group - to meet with Commissioners every now and then - to influence - but didn't work.

In a statement in the press of February 28, 1961, you said that the Commission had not got at the underlying aims and objectives of education. Could you explain this statement?

Terms of reference included developing broad philosophy but Commission had been unable to do this. (Refer to Swift's Curriculum Guide.)

Were you and other members of the Government influenced by Commissions on education in other provinces in your decision to establish one in Alberta?

Yes, strengthened their ideas that it was a good thing and feasible.

In a statement in the press of February 21, 1961 you indicated that there was a lot of public reaction to the publication of the Report. Could you comment on: the form in which the feedback was received, general trends in the comment, what happened to this material, how was it used in the deliberations of the Government, did the material have a direct effect on subsequent policy making?

See answer to question "What feedback reached the Government?" (page 390).

SPECIFIC DETAILS

Was the budget for the Commission decided on in advance? If so, who set the limit on spending?

See previous sections.

What factors entered into the selection of Commissioners?

See previous sections.

Was there any pressure exerted on the Government to have certain people?

No.

Who actually put the names forward?

See previous sections.

What was your reaction to the statements of the Provincial Treasurer quoted in the press which were somewhat derogatory towards the effects and working of royal commissions in general and also to the Cameron Commission in particular?

Aalborg explained Hinman's action in the following way:

Hinman had been a school Superintendent - had well developed ideas on education of his own. As Treasurer he was likely to have a "hard nosed" attitude on spending Government money. His own opinions not in agreement with others (thought others too impractical) - was a blunt speaker. Aalborg didn't take much notice.

How influential was the Commission in subsequent policy-making on education?

Very influential. (Suggest look at implementations.) e.g. Led to a lot of activity in legislation.

Was the Commission directly responsible for change in the system of education in Alberta or did it merely anticipate changes which would have occurred anyway?

Commission was responsible for change in system: either altered direction of some changes and/or accelerated others.

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

Attention given more to teacher training and role of teacher in system, had a bearing on curriculum, Royal Commission seen as the best way of conducting this particular study.

Can you list any definite criticisms?

Led to slowness in implementation.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta, been by the 1959 Commission?

To quite an extent.

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning?

Do you think it was necessary?
Why did it arise?

Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon?
Did you contribute to this Commission?
Would you say that there was much difference between the 1959 and 1969 investigations?
What did the 1969 Commission accomplish?
Which do you think had the greater impact?

Time: not surprised - decade of 1960s great period of change, need for investigation into education.

In contrast to 1959 Commission - Worth Commission was (many sub-studies - huge effort) elaborate and full-scale.

Political realm: Social Credit party after Manning retired, had a new Premier and young Minister of Education - Faculty of Education pressed for investigation - "New" Government wanted to do something fresh.

Not really possible to compare the efforts of each because were held in different times and for different reasons; methods differed, etc.

50s Golden Age	60s
- Post war	- "the bigger, better, more affluent" taken for granted
- Decade brought prosperity beyond the expectations of people.	- led to reaction at end of 60s.
	- fear that a crash was inevitable.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT

Recommendation for Permanent Commission (#280): represented the Commission's view, of itself - not taken seriously by Government.

Was satisfied with the job it had done.

INTERVIEWS: GROUP (D) PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS

NAME: Dr. S. Clarke DATE: Thursday, June 13, 1974

POSITION: Secretary of ATA CATEGORY: Professional Educator

N.B. Department of Educational Psychology Professor, Faculty of Education - then 1st of January, 1959 Secretary to ATA.

What was the role of the ATA prior to, during and after the Commission, in general terms? (e.g. relation of ATA to the Government.)

Commission set up hurriedly by Government - therefore didn't get input from organized groups (in his opinion).

Influences at time: 1957 - U.S. ferment over education - followed in Canada, concern over lack of rigour, e.g. Neatby "So Little for the Mind," newspaper comments.

It was not likely that ATA would press for Commission (See Eric Ansley, former Secretary of ATA) which would investigate teachers.

Operation: Clarke's connection with brief was his entrance to ATA.

ATA decided their submission would cover everything included in terms of reference. Dinner called at Mayfair Country Club - number of people invited (Ansley consulted with Coutts over this) - ATA explained that each person should write up analysis and recommendations for education in Alberta - according to their area of expertise, e.g. Clarke did one - Time approximately March 1958. ATA got materials from 25-30 Faculty of Education staff.

Materials looked at and recognized need for a lot of time and energy for editing and therefore needed to employ someone - went to Coutts who was a friend of profession generally, and teachers especially - ATA trusted him - got three recommendations: Card, Sparby, Clarke. Clarke chosen (worked 1-1/2 months for $400). Took all submissions, rewrote, analysed, deleted, drew out submissions, wrote much himself.

Drew up mode of presentation:

Narrative + Recommendations → Body and then summarize recommendations at end
(Note: Same format in Cameron and Worth Reports)

Thus Clarke: general editor of ATA brief to Cameron Commission. (Own area of interest school guidance.)

Therefore close contact of Faculty of Education and ATA represented a knowledge input - Professor of education - (with expert knowledge) aided ATA (with political clout) to deliver knowledge to Government (implementer).

First task as Executive Secretary - condensation of Cameron Commission Report - aim to disseminate information widely (26,000 copies printed - 2-3 weeks work) - worried about minority report (Jesuit-like argument) had predetermined reduction by 1/4; however Cormack complimented him on the result. (Clarke feels there were at least two writing styles - therefore supports argument of different authors.)

*Dissemination of knowledge main feature of condensation although designed for professional audience rather than general public.

Post Submission of Report:

Calgary Herald and Edmonton Journal gave vicious treatment of Commission Report - so Clarke got approval from ATA to set up protest against treatment (Publisher W. MacDonald of Edmonton Journal - not popular).

ATA had smarted at hands of Journal - wanted to strike back - purpose to get trustees and teachers together; ASTA and ATA (Secretary of ASTA T. Weidenhammer) - so a letter of protest was sent to Philip Fisher, Chairman of Board of Directors of Southam Corporation - put on ATA stationery with signatures of President and Secretary of ATA, and President and Secretary of ASTA.

Protest: main points:

1. Journal - monopoly newspaper therefore gave onesided accounts.
2. Presentation biased and unfair.

Didn't get acknowledgement of receipt - or any other reply - but did shake publisher of Journal - W. MacDonald - therefore Journal and Herald changed their tone gradually. (Clarke told Cameron and Mowat about protest letter.)

ATA conducted other investigations on Cameron Report, e.g. E. Ingram involved in professional development - developed report: The Cameron Commission - Two Years After.

What was the extent of co-operation between the ATA and the Faculty of Education prior to, during and after the Commission?

(Faculty of Education founded because [of idea] of M. E. Lazerte and John Barnett [political power] - and therefore a tradition of close association - continued by Dr. Coutts), explains why they worked closely together.

Commission trying to give impression of impartiality - thus communication between ATA, Faculty and Commissioners limited to social contact - apart from official input. (Commission employed H. Baker as English expert - to work over Report - for style, etc.)

Can you assess the influence of the ATA (briefs and other input) on the Commission's recommendations?

The most important brief - ATA. The Faculty of Education brief which was written after ATA brief, seemed to reinforce position taken by teachers' association and so markedly influenced Commission's recommendations.

What was your perception of other influential groups in this respect at the time?

ATA and Faculty of Education - major input - all other groups of lesser importance - Professional dominant over lay opinion.

Did the Commission directly influence educational change in Alberta or merely anticipate changes which would have occurred anyway?

Crystallised and accelerated certain things but main purpose of Commission expressed as: Government wanted Commission to take heat off; representations had to be sent to Commission not Government - provided breathing space for Government; changes Government might hesitate to make would receive the sanction of the Commission.

Could you offer some comparisons between the Cameron Commission of 1959 and the Worth Commission of 1969?

Same kind of Government, i.e. Social Credit - didn't want another Minority Report so appointed only one Commissioner.

Dissatisfaction over education expressed as great outcry over finance - temper of the 1960s differed from 1950s. (Yet Worth Commission at meetings around province found people wanted money spent on education but not out of local taxes.)

Financial considerations included in Worth Commission - omitted from Cameron Commission.

Preston Manning influence on his father to look ahead - also Eric Schmidt - these were knowledge inputs.

There was faith in sociology at the time as a means of overcoming social problems.

Clark surprised - no need - for Worth Commission.

Take into account influence of Hall-Dennis Report from Ontario (Social Credit - Conservative government).

NAME: Dr. H. Coutts

DATE: Monday, May 27, 1974 and
Monday, June 3, 1974.

POSITION: Dean, Faculty of Education

CATEGORY: Professional Educator

BACKGROUND

Were you a member of the Advisory Committee on Education set up in September 1957, prior to the Commission? If so, could you tell me of its work?

No.

Could you indicate the factors which were prominent in thinking on education at the time of the Commission?

Let us look at the background since World War II. Alberta had been the first Canadian province to place all teacher preparation in a university, the University of Alberta. Some pragmatists on the staff of the newly created Faculty of Education saw education as more than academic study and gave leadership in the efforts to broaden its base. The views of these staff members were in conflict with those expressed by Hilda Neatby in So Little for the Mind.

Changes in the matriculation requirements removed trigonometry as a provincial examination subject. At the same time there had been a reduction in the number of units of modern languages and Latin required. Some non-Alberta universities refused to accept matriculation students on the reciprocal basis which had formerly applied and the parents of these students were critical.

The Government of Alberta, as was the case with governments in other provinces, used the Royal Commission approach to take the heat off themselves to serve as a buffer between the public and the government on a variety of matters in education. At the same time political opposition to the Social Credit Government in Alberta was not great and that Government used many devices - public seminars, the Royal Commission, etc. - for judging public opinion. The Government seemed sensitive to testing public opinion and considering it when developing plans and legislation.

The Hope Commission in Ontario had some influence on the thinking that led to the Royal Commission's origin in Alberta. Royal Commissions were concurrently, or almost so, conducting similar studies in Manitoba and British Columbia. During the period members of all these Commissions met at least once in Banff.

As mentioned above, there was, in all of Canada, a long range reaction to Hilda Neatby's book So Little for the Mind.

Could you briefly describe the philosophy underlying Albertan education at the time of the Commission?

At the time the Commission began its work, and this is documented in the Faculty of Education Brief to the Commission, there was emphasis on universality of opportunity in education. The activity movement of the late 20s and 30s had been reflected in the enterprise and group process approaches in the Alberta curriculum. As reflections of the progressive movement in education, these had become attenuated by the 50s. The pragmatic philosophy and the relativism of some of the progressivists was being challenged by a new kind of idealism. There did not seem however to be one philosophy dominant (e.g. The course in philosophy of education given to teachers was eclectic enough though there were separate courses for non-Roman Catholic students and Roman Catholic students with the latter receiving a greater emphasis on Thomism).

Dr. Coutts' personal position favors giving a variety of points of view in order that professionally oriented teachers may put together their own directions (philosophy is probably too pretentious) for education. Dr. Coutts does not favor preaching didactically one single philosophy of education.

CONCERNING THE SETTING UP OF THE COMMISSION

Do you think that education was a high priority concern of the Government at that time?

The Government of the time was favourable to education in general and to teacher education which it had in 1943 brought completely into the university "system" of the province.

What were other important social problems with which the Government had to deal?

In the early 40s the Government had set up Post-war Reconstruction Committees in a number of areas: economics, industry, social problems, education, etc.

What were the crucial factors influencing the setting up of the Commission in 1957?

One was that trustees were interested in getting more revenue from the province. (See also comments on educational attitudes section.)

Who initiated the move to establish a royal commission on education?

Not sure but Home and School Association may have had an input.

What was the Commission's main purpose?

To examine the adequacy of educational offerings at elementary and secondary levels; also to test public opinion on various issues (a device for shifting people's criticisms of Government - displaced to Commission).

What was the Commission's main task? (Can you differentiate between purpose and task?)

To uncover the facts about aspects of elementary and secondary education.

What part did the Government play in this?

To my knowledge the Commission was left free to vary its study free of Government interference or pressure.

What part did the Department of Education play in this?

To my knowledge the Department of Education left the Commission free to make its study. The Department cooperated by providing information and cooperation.

Could you describe the steps in the procedure for establishing the Commission?

No.

Who selected the Commissioners and Secretary?

While I am not aware of the process by which the Commissioners were selected, I do know that the then President of the University of Alberta was consulted.

Who defined the terms of reference?

I do not know who determined the terms of reference of the Commission.

What criteria were used for these steps?

I do not know what criteria were used.

Why was the royal commission method of investigation chosen; what were the precedents for its use?

The Royal Commission was the traditional method used by Canadian governments - federal and provincial - for making studies of this kind.

CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

What part, if any, was played by the Government.

It is Dr. Coutts' opinion that the Commission operated free of Government interference and pressure.

What part, if any, was played by the Department of Education?

The Department of Education supplied resource staff and information.

(Dr. Coutts stated that he was interviewed individually on matters relating to teacher education and the teaching of English. The meeting was in camera.)

Was there any Cabinet or caucus discussion of the Commission while it was in operation?

Dr. Coutts had no information about discussions which might have taken place in the Cabinet on this or other matters.

Was it incumbent on the Commissioners to report their progress from time to time during the two years of their investigation? If so, what form did that reporting take?

It was not incumbent on the Commissioners to report their progress from time to time. Actually the media carried reports of the activities of the Commission and of the substance of various briefs and interviews.

CONCERNING THE TABLING OF THE REPORT AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

In general, what was the Government's reaction?

The Government seemed satisfied that the purpose had been achieved.

Was the Report in accord with the original Order-in-Council?

Dr. Coutts felt unable to comment helpfully.

What was the Deputy Minister's reaction?

Which areas of recommendations were most important in the Government's view?

In the Department's view?

What was the nature and extent of legislation required?

Were there any recommendations contrary to Government or Departmental policy?

Dr. Coutts felt unable to comment helpfully on these questions.

How were decisions made to implement certain recommendations and not others, and to implement them at different times?

On the public/separate school issue the Government based its action on Cabinet decision as it did on matters related to educational policy. The Government consulted the teaching profession, the trustees, the Department of Education staff on relevant matters included in the Commission's recommendations.

What was the reaction of the public to the Report?

The public was interested in the Report of the Commission but there did not seem to be any great sense of action, involvement, or reaction to its recommendations. The media did a good job of reporting and of focussing attention on the major recommendations and issues. Dr. Coutts felt that the public generally were rather apathetic toward the Report, especially with the passage of time. Certainly he saw nothing revolutionary in evidence.

Could you give any impressions of the reactions of organized groups?

This did not seem to be of great concern. Organized groups reacted in evolutionary rather than revolutionary fashion.

What feedback reached the Government, e.g. from Departmental Committees and other sources?

Dr. Coutts feels unable to comment helpfully.

What part did this feedback play in the action taken by the Government?

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the Report?

Was there any opposition in the Legislature to the action taken by the Government?

Dr. Coutts feels unable to comment helpfully on these questions.

QUESTIONS RELATED TO POSITION AS DEAN

What part did the Faculty of Education play in having the Commission set up?

The Faculty of Education had no direct involvement in having the Commission set up.

What part did the Faculty play during the inquiry?

The Faculty as a whole participated in the preparation of its brief. Individuals, e.g. Coutts, Baker, appeared before the Commission to discuss specific issues. Dr. G. Mowat was selected as Commissioner and became Vice-Chairman. Dr. Coutts felt that Dr. Mowat was selected because he was recognized as a person whose judgment and objectivity were recognized not because he was a member of the staff of the Faculty of Education. Some like R. S. MacArthur and Harold Uhlman made studies for the Commission. This was because of their expertise rather than because of their association with the Faculty of Education.

Faculty of Education Brief: Part I dealt with background and broad policies. After Part I was complete, the then President of the University specifically suggested that the Faculty address itself to all details related to curriculum and related matters. The cooperation of the total staff of the Faculty was enlisted to produce Part II of the Faculty brief which dealt with each curricular area in depth (English, Mathematics, etc.).

(As an aside Dr. Coutts mentioned that Professor Card, Eric Ansley, McKim Ross, himself and others, were concurrently preparing the ATA brief.)

The Faculty of Education had the opportunity of discussing its brief on several occasions with the Commission. Dr. Coutts felt that the Commission provided an opportunity for a full presentation and clarification of the Faculty's brief. As with the Report as a whole, the brief of the Faculty elicited little public interest. The timetable for increasing the number of years of teacher preparation for certification from one to two to three to four years was something one could continue to emphasise - and we did - until four years became the basic requirement. (Others factors that developed probably influenced the decisions more than the recommendations of the Commission.)

What was the Faculty reaction to the published Report?

Some Faculty of Education staff members did considerable public speaking to various groups with respect to the report. Dr. Coutts made a set of transparencies summarizing the recommendations and indicating what was pertinent to planning in the Faculty of Education and what was already being done in teacher education. Most meetings addressed were parent groups.

Was there any particular reaction to the Minority Report?

Dr. Coutts mentioned that there were queries concerning the authorship of the Minority Report. The Faculty of Education policy tried to keep religion outside its concerns. Dr. Coutts felt that not much notice was taken of the Minority Report except that the then Government and its successor were sensitive to the issues it raised.

What part did the Faculty play after the Report was tabled?

Various departments studied the Report, but not in a systematic way. Faculty members had participated in Andrews' study on the goals of education. One can never evaluate the effect on individual members of the Report.

Did the Commission influence any of the Faculty's subsequent policies, either directly or indirectly?

The Report of the Commission reinforced the Faculty of Education's interest in four years of academic/professional preparation for initial certification. This was because of the joint interest of the ATA and the Faculty of Education in trying to develop a strong teaching profession and to improve the educational programs of the province.

Do you think the Commission did influence educational change in Alberta, or did it merely anticipate change which would have occurred anyway?

In some areas change was affected directly, e.g. refining of school finance programs. In the main, however, the directions of change indicated in the Report were in process. They may have been speeded up as a result of the Report, e.g. the development of Community Colleges.

SUMMATION

What do you see as the most favourable aspects of the Commission?

The selection of the personnel of the Commission was sound. The Commissioners represented a wide diversity of interests in education in the province. Senator Cameron gave dignity and a sense of confidence and responsibility. Dr. Coutts felt that Dr. Mowat was the real pivot of the Commission. He felt that Dr. Rees, as Secretary, was objective and, while approaching his assignment as a good civil servant must do, certainly influenced the discussion. Cormack was well chosen to present separate school concerns. In the same way, Wilma Hansen (Home and School and parents generally), Mrs. Taylor (farmers and farm women), Douglas (business), etc. were well chosen to represent the broad interests of Albertans. The methods used to test public opinion - briefs, interviews, research studies - were suitable and effective. The Report was well written. The Report, in line with the Commission's terms of reference, addressed itself to problems of elementary and secondary education. (Some of us felt that tertiary education should also have been included). The Report seemed realistic with emphasis of the evolutionary rather than the revolutionary. It described and analyzed what at that time was being done and pointed in a modest way directions for change.

Can you list any definite criticisms?

Dr. Coutts did not see this Report as a particularly good device for influencing change. Change he felt, occurs as a result of the influence and efforts of individuals and interested groups. The Commission may have given individuals (and groups) the opportunity to speak out on directions for change.

How influenced has the education of today in Alberta been by the 1959 Commission?

See answer to the question "Do you think the Commission did influence educational change in Alberta, or did it merely anticipate change which would have occurred anyway?" (page 402).

Could you offer some comments on the 1969 Commission on Educational Planning? (e.g. Did you think it was necessary? Why did it arise? Were you surprised that there should have been another Commission so soon? Did you contribute to the Commission? Would you say there was much difference between the two Commissions? What did the 1969 Commission accomplish? Which did you think had the greater impact?

Dr. Coutts was not surprised that the 1969 Commission was set up. A number of important steps had not been taken following 1959. The whole relationship of elementary and secondary education to post-secondary education was brought into focus by the new conditions of the 1960s. There was a need to rationalize post-secondary education and to relate it to basic levels of the education process and system. There was need to coordinate what was to be the function of colleges, institutes and universities. This had not been within the terms of reference of the Cameron Commission and it had not been done. The University of Alberta (and its Faculty of Education) had been asking for years that a rationalization of Alberta's provisions for post-secondary education be made.

As a result of the influence of Neatby and Sputnik, there had been a resurgence of the more academic aspects of education, particularly from the latter emphasis in mathematics and the sciences. During the 1960s there had been a shift (gradual at first, rather revolutionary later) toward individual personal development. This was reflected in student activism which filtered from the universities to college and high schools. There grew as a result an emphasis on education for individual development, for conservation of the environment, for elimination of or at least amelioration of poverty. The Cameron Commission had not addressed itself to any of these issues.

Worth was selected on the Commission, partly because he is an extremely able person, partly because he was strongly convinced that education costs were rising at an unprecedented rate. (Dr. Coutts has found difficulty in rationalizing the worth of Academic Plan No. 8 of the Faculty of Education with the worth of the 1969 Commission.) A major problem, as Worth saw it, was the distribution of funds to the various facets of the educational enterprise and to specific educational organizations.

The educational community saw a need for an investigation that would address itself to the total range of educational problems. The Worth Commission appeared to have this objective, but there was considerable disappointment and disillusionment about what was actually done.

Dr. Coutts felt that parts of the total problem would have been handled better by committees with more limited responsibilities, e.g. one on the rationalization of post-secondary education could have focused in grester depth on this problem.

With respect to a philosophical point of view, Dr. Coutts felt that this might have been looked at as a thing in itself. He continues however, to believe that it is difficult in a pluralistic society like that in Alberta to do more than identify various philosophical points of view and to seek and eclectic basis for principle of operation. We will never satisfy the views of everyone.

The Worth Commission used many of the same procedures used by the

Cameron Commission - briefs, interviews, studies. Probably the approaches were different, but not significantly so. The idea of a single Commissioner with an Advisory Committee marks the chief difference in approach in 1969.

Worth was appointed by one Government (Social Credit) and reported to another (Progressive Conservative). One can never know what this may have meant in the presentation of the Report. When the Conservative Government appointed Worth as Deputy Minister of its Department of Advanced Education, it must have felt that they were in sympathy with some, at least, of his ideas and he with theirs. Certainly a Deputy Minister, while he may influence government decisions, must be prepared to implement government policies.

Coutts wrote a ten page letter to Worth while the Commission was in operation. In this letter, Coutts outlined his ideas on a number of matters related to education, but he was not called to react to these in a hearing.

ASIDE

In Alberta, more than in most other provinces, there was, especially in the 1950s and early 1960s, a close exchange of understanding and general commitment on the part of the leaders of the chief groups whose major concern was with education: the staff of the Department of Education, the Faculty of Education, the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Alberta School Trustees' Association, and the Alberta Federation of Home and Schools Associations. There was a sort of fraternity of individuals who, in spite of the disparate views of the organizations they represented, had a commonality of educational purpose and commitment at various times; this group included, among others, Dr. Byrne, Dr. Rees, Dr. Clarke, McKim Ross, Edward Parr, Mattie McCullough, Dr. Coutts, School Superintendents, High School Inspectors. Members of this informal "fraternity" sat on each others committees, putting education ahead of almost everything else. It is for this reason that Dr. Coutts believes that PEOPLE more than COMMISSIONS have effected educational change in Alberta.

The therapeutic effect of the Cameron Commission was most important considering the climate of the time it was appointed.

NAME: Dr. R. MacArthur
DATE: June 25, 1974

POSITION: Professor,
Educational Psychology
Faculty of Education
CATEGORY: Professional Educator

What was your position at the time of the Commission?

On staff in Educational Psychology - Faculty of Education (from 1955 to present).

Did you work full-time or part-time for the Commission?

Full-time with ten weeks out for Carnegie Travelling grant.

How were you selected for the research directorship?

Received call after had been selected by a meeting of President, Dean, Department Chairman, Dr. Dunlop (behind Alberta Advisory Council on Educational Research) - probably connected with his involvement with CEA - Kellog Project on Educational Leadership and his writing on evaluation in Canadian Education Journal - would have been known in University.

What was the extent of responsibility of the position?

Responsible for overall direction of all research projects, but in detail involved only in some, e.g. teacher study, matriculation standards, evaluation and departmental exams.

Had to outline proposal for research project, calculate budget, engage personnel, draw up contract - send in monthly reports to Commission on status of projects - plans needed to be submitted to Commission and discussed prior to the research being undertaken.

Regarding your staff: How was it selected? Who were the members? How was the research task delegated?

Extremely difficult to get research personnel - no doctoral programme in Faculty of Education from which to draw students; used university professors. MacArthur dealt personally with topic in which he was interested and competent - otherwise delegated, e.g. Mowat and Hanson collaborated in finance study.

What was the total research attempted? Why was it required and how was it accomplished?

Total should be able to be obtained from reports. He realized that Commission would need information on certain topics, e.g. status of teachers so got it organized - other topics arose from Commission's needs when problems were recognised from hearings on briefs. Note flexibility - also Commission didn't really know what it wanted most of the time. MacArthur given nine months in which to conduct research and have reports ready (deadline was extended later).

MacArthur had to select research personnel - discuss with them the problem - work out details - budget etc. - (calculated budget by finding out usual consulting fees for university workers, e.g. from McCalla and Harries).

N.B. Some research involved survey techniques, other - historical and also some case studies.

Where could I obtain reports of all the research?

- See Research Director's reports, perhaps in Department of Education.

What influence did the results of the research have on the formulation of recommendations by the Commissioners?

Couldn't say unless recommendations are checked one by one but Commissioners were very conscientious about going through all the information input to try to arrive at the 'wisest' decision.

Was the research useful in other spheres?

AACER sponsored the publication of a series of monographs on the Commission research - this would have reached a wider audience. ATA, for example, has continued the teacher status study up to the present time.

In your opinion did the Commission cause change in education in Alberta subsequently or merely anticipate changes which would have occurred anyway?

Couldn't really say but imagined that small points may have been innovative, e.g. his notion of quality control in the examinations study, began to be used in educational research after this; but imagined that it probably anticipated changes which would have occurred - because it was a time of pendulum swing - dissatisfaction with education - need for change.

Any further comment?

Cooperation from all concerned in research and those providing data unusually high, e.g. cited research on teacher status - University, e.g. dean of faculty, ATA, Chief Superintendent from Department, head of Inspectors - in working session developed questionnaire - very many groups cooperated in its distribution and follow-up - > 99% return.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFA: Alberta Federation of Agriculture

AFHSA: Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations

ASTA: Alberta School Trustees' Association

ATA: Alberta Teachers' Association

AWI: Alberta Women's Institute

FUA: Farmers' Union of Alberta

FWUA: Farm Women's Union of Alberta

IODE: International Order of Daughters of the Empire

PC: Progressive Conservative

SC: Social Credit

UFA: United Farmers of Alberta

U of A: University of Alberta